

The Philadelphia Parking Authority
701 Market Street, Suite 5400
Philadelphia, PA 19106

RFP No. 26-12

**Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central Software Licensing, Implementation
and Support Services**
Addendum Two

To: See Email Distribution List
From: Shannon Stewart
Manager of Contract Administration
Date: June 25, 2026
No Pages: 76

This addendum is issued on June 25, 2026, prior to the proposal due date to add, delete, modify, clarify and/or to respond to questions submitted by eligible Offerors regarding the work included in the above referenced solicitation.

CHANGES TO THE RFP DOCUMENT

1. Part IV.2.A.8.: Section A.8. of the Work Statement has been revised to the following:

Ensure compliance with ~~WCAG 2.1 AA accessibility standards~~ and all applicable public records obligations as prescribed by the Pennsylvania Right-to-Know Law.

2. Part IV.2.U.: Section U.1 of the Work Statement has been revised to the following:

U. Integration Requirements

1. Offerors must ensure that the proposed Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central solution supports integration with ~~existing Authority systems that support parking operations, citation processing, permitting systems, or revenue management platforms. The Authority currently uses Sage HRMS for payroll but is migrating to Dayforce.~~ **the Authority's Human Resource Information System (Currently Sage HRMS and the proposed DayForce) and with current banking systems for disbursement processing to include ACH production and interfacing with daily banking activity. The only integration for the Revenue Management portion is TD's E-Bill platform. The Authority's current bank platforms are TD Bank, Santander and Fulton Bank.**

QUESTIONS

1. **Question:** We currently do not hold a Pennsylvania registration and cannot submit an active PA Department of State record from file.dos.pa.gov. Is this a mandatory requirement and if yes can it be procured at the time of contract award.

Response: Offerors must be registered with the Pennsylvania Department of State's Bureau of Corporations and Charitable Organizations at the time of proposal submission. This cannot be obtained after contract award.

2. **Question:** Are we required to have a current registration with the Pennsylvania Department of State's Bureau of Corporations and Charitable Organizations before the award of contract? Or are we able to receive this registration if awarded the contract.

Response: See response to Question 1.

3. **Question:** We do not currently hold a Philadelphia Commercial Activities License number (or explanation of exemption). Is it mandatory for Offerors to hold such a license and if not what are the exceptions for an exemption?

Response: As stated in I-13 of the RFP document, "If the Offeror does not currently have a Philadelphia Commercial Activity License, it must obtain one no later than five business days after notification of selection."

4. **Question:** Section II-3 requires Offerors to identify the number of full cycle implementations completed and experience with government agencies. Section I-17 permits the use of subcontractors identified in the proposal. May an Offeror include the past performance, references, and implementation experience of identified subcontractors to satisfy the qualifications and experience requirements outlined in Part II and evaluated under Part III criteria (b)? If so, must the subcontractor's references be submitted separately from the prime Offeror's references in Tab B, or may they be combined?

Response: No. The Prime Offeror must satisfy the primary qualifications and experience requirements outlined in the RFP.

The Authority will consider the experience, references, and past performance of identified subcontractors as supplemental information only. Subcontractor experience must not be used as the sole basis to satisfy the Prime Offeror's qualifications, full-cycle implementation experience, GP-to-Business Central migration experience, government agency experience, or evaluation requirements.

If subcontractor experience is included, it must be clearly identified separately from the Prime Offeror's experience. The proposal must identify which work was performed by the Prime Offeror and which work was performed by the subcontractor. Subcontractor references must be submitted separately or clearly labeled so the Authority can distinguish them from the Prime Offeror's references.

The Prime Offeror remains fully responsible for all project services, subcontractor performance, deliverables, implementation, licensing, support, and contract obligations.

5. **Question:** How many full-cycle Business Central implementations does the Authority expect as a minimum benchmark?

Response: The Authority has not established a specific minimum number of full-cycle Business Central implementations as a mandatory benchmark. Vendors should provide examples of relevant full-cycle ERP implementations, including Business Central projects of similar size, scope, complexity, and public-sector or quasi-government experience, where applicable. The Authority will evaluate experience based on the quality, relevance, and complexity of the vendor's prior implementations.

6. **Question:** Does the Authority prefer direct public-sector experience, or will comparable regulated enterprise finance implementations be considered equivalent?

Response: Refer to section II-3 of the RFP document.

7. **Question:** For GP to Business Central migration experience, should examples include only completed go-lives or also active projects in progress?

Response: Offerors may include both completed go-lives and active projects in progress, but they should clearly identify the status of each project. Completed GP-to-Business Central go-lives will be given stronger consideration.

8. **Question:** Are named resources required for all roles at proposal stage, or are role-based profiles acceptable for some positions?

Response: Named resources are preferred for key project roles. Role-based profiles are acceptable for some supporting positions, as long as the vendor provides the role's qualifications, experience, responsibilities, and expected involvement. Final staffing will be confirmed during contract negotiation or project kickoff.

9. **Question:** Section II-13 states that the MB-800 Dynamics 365 Business Central Functional Consultant Associate certification is required and must be held by project team members. Section II-4 requires Offerors to provide documentation of relevant professional certifications for key personnel. If the MB-800 certification is held by personnel from an identified subcontractor who will be assigned to the project team, does this satisfy the certification requirement in Tab L? Or is it required that the prime Offeror's own employees hold the MB-800 certification?

Response: The MB-800 certification requirement must be satisfied by the Prime Offeror's own project team personnel.

The Authority requires the Prime Contractor to be fully qualified and directly responsible for the Business Central implementation. Certifications held only by subcontractor or teaming partner personnel must not be used as the sole basis to satisfy the Prime Offeror's certification requirement.

Subcontractor certifications may be submitted as supplemental qualifications if the subcontractor is clearly identified, approved by the Authority, and assigned to the project team. However, the Prime Offeror must demonstrate that its own key personnel assigned to the Authority's project hold the required MB-800 certification or other applicable Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central credentials.

The Prime Contractor remains fully responsible for all project services, deliverables, subcontractor performance, and contract obligations.

10. **Question:** Section II-3 references experience migrating from Microsoft Dynamics GP to Business Central as a preferred qualification. For the purposes of satisfying the qualifications and experience requirements in Tab B, will the Authority accept case studies and references from comparable ERP migrations, such as migrations from other legacy Microsoft ERP platforms to Business Central, in addition to or in lieu of GP to BC specific migration experience?

Response: The Authority prefers specific experience migrating from Microsoft Dynamics GP to Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central.

Case studies and references from comparable ERP migrations may be submitted in addition to GP-to-Business Central experience; however, comparable ERP migrations must not replace the preferred GP-to-Business Central experience unless the Offeror clearly explains how the project is relevant to the Authority's scope.

Offerors must identify the number of full-cycle Business Central implementations completed and the number of successful Microsoft Dynamics GP to Business Central migrations. Offerors may also include comparable legacy Microsoft ERP or other ERP migration projects that demonstrate relevant experience with data conversion, financial system migration, reporting, integrations, testing, training, cutover, and post-go-live support.

The Authority will evaluate experience based on relevance, complexity, demonstrated success, public-sector or similar organizational experience, and the Offeror's ability to meet the Authority's Business Central implementation and migration requirements.

11. **Question:** Will there be a recording of the Pre-Proposal meeting?

Response: No, the meeting was not recorded but the meeting minutes are available on the Authority's website using the link below:

<https://philapark.org/2026/05/rfp-no-26-12-microsoft-dynamics-365-business-central-software-licensing-implementation-and-support-services/>

12. Question: Please confirm whether the 15% Small/Small Diverse Business participation score can only be earned through certified Small/Small Diverse Business status or certified subcontractor participation, or whether equivalent commitments such as Pennsylvania-based participation, local hiring, or supplier diversity initiatives may also be considered?

Response: Points will only be awarded for Small and Small Diverse participation. Please refer to I-7 of the RFP document for additional information.

13. Question: We are not SBPI-certified. Is it mandatory for Offerors to identify SBPI-certified subcontractors and specify the percentage and dollar amount of work assigned and submit SBPI certificate copies for each certified entity. Can Offerors engage with PPA without any SBPI-certified subcontractors?

Response: Although the Authority strongly encourages small and small diverse business participation, it is not required.

14. Question: Does the Authority accept Pennsylvania DGS Small Business Procurement Initiative self-certification completed after the RFP was issued but before the proposal due date, or must certification be in hand prior to submission?

Response: Yes, the Authority will accept self-certification completed after the RFP release date but it must be completed by proposal submission.

15. Question: Please confirm whether Appendix C insurance requirements are strictly mandatory as stated, or whether PPA will consider reasonable policy modifications through the addendum process. Also confirm whether an insurer letter confirming the ability to provide required coverage, including \$5M Cyber Liability, will be acceptable at proposal submission, with final coverage obtained upon award and before contract execution/project commencement.

Response: Please refer to I-10 of the RFP document.

16. Question: Do any sub-contractors that we submit with have to provide their financials or just the prime?

Response: Financial statements are only required for the prime.

17. Question: Please confirm whether contract exceptions, such as Microsoft SaaS pass-through terms, limitation of liability and acceptance timing, will materially reduce scoring.

Response: Contract exceptions may reduce scoring.

18. Question: Please confirm whether the legal disclosure requirement is limited to pending matters involving governmental agencies with which the Offeror has or had a contractual relationship, or whether all pending matters, including private-party matters, must be disclosed.

Response: As stated in II-12 of the RFP document, Offerors must disclose any legal actions, suits, proceedings, claims or investigations pending with any governmental agency with which the Offeror has had or currently has a contractual relationship. Any actions pending with private-parties do not need to be disclosed.

19. Question: In terms of Disclosure of Legal Actions and Summary of any current/pending legal actions, suits, investigations with any governmental agency, we do not currently have one with any government agency. However, there may be legal suit pending with a private firm. Does that disqualify us from bidding for this project and is it required for us to divulge the details of that legal suit.

Response: See response to Question 18.

20. Question: Can the Authority clarify the order of precedence between the contract, RFP, exhibits and proposal where Microsoft licensing terms differ from contract language?

Response: It is the Contractor's responsibility to study the proposed Contract and to report to the Authority any inconsistencies, discrepancies, omissions, or conflicts discovered between any provisions of the Contract and the Microsoft licensing terms. Once notified by the Contractor, the Authority will make a good faith effort to ensure that the contractual language comports with the Microsoft licensing terms during contract negotiations.

21. Question: Can the Authority clarify whether termination for convenience allows recovery of committed licensing, subcontractor or third-party costs?

Response: The Authority will pay Contractor for any Services performed up to the date of termination.

22. Question: Will the Authority accept limitations of liability provisions for professional services, excluding confidentiality, data breach, willful misconduct and IP infringement?

Response: Any proposed limitation of liability language must be included in the Contractor's Proposal. The Authority will review the proposed language and may negotiate the terms of the proposed limitation of liability language with the selected Contractor. The Authority is under no obligation to accept the proposed limitation of liability language.

23. Question: Can the Authority clarify whether 24/7 support language in the sample contract is mandatory or can support follow the SLA proposed in Tab F?

Response: The 24/7 support language in the Sample Contract is not mandatory. The Contractor will propose its Support language in Tab F of its Proposal and SLA for the Authority's review. The Support language in the Contractor's proposal may be negotiated by the Authority and the selected Contractor.

24. Question: Will the Authority accept standard Microsoft CSP licensing terms for subscription cancellations, renewals and price changes?

Response: The Authority will make a good faith effort to ensure that the contractual language comports with the Microsoft licensing terms.

25. Question: Please confirm whether PPA would consider a mutual limitation of liability capped at three months of fees paid by the Authority. This limitation would not apply to claims arising from gross negligence, willful misconduct, fraud, tortious acts, or other legally uncapped obligations?

Response: Any proposed limitation of liability language must be included in the Contractor's Proposal. The Authority will review the proposed language and may negotiate the terms of the proposed limitation of liability language with the selected Contractor. The Authority is under no obligation to accept the proposed limitation of liability language.

26. Question: Is compliance with Pennsylvania Right-to-Know Law expected to be supported through system functionality alone, or also through contractor-defined operational procedures?

Response: Contractor is required to comply with the Pennsylvania Right-to-Know Law (RTKL) while providing Services under the Contract. Depending on the specific request, it may be through system functionality alone or through contractor-defined operational procedures, or even both.

27. Question: Are Partner/Subcontractors working under Prime required to carry the same insurance limits as the prime Contractor, including \$5M cyber liability?

Response: No. Please see section 32.2 of the Sample Contract regarding Assignability.

28. Question: Does the Authority expect the Contractor to indemnify for Microsoft product infringement or only for Contractor-developed customizations and services?

Response: Please see section 16.3.1 of the Sample Contract regarding infringement.

29. Question: Regarding Section I-23, Financial Statements, is there any prohibition against submitting financial statements for the last three years that have not been audited by an independent Certified Public Accountant firm?

Response: **Non-audited financial statements for the last three years will be accepted, as long as they follow GAAP standards.**

30. Question: As a privately held company, we are not required to maintain audited financial statements. Can this requirement be waived? We respectfully request a waiver of this requirement and confirm that we possess the financial capacity, resources, and operational capability necessary to successfully perform and fulfill all contractual obligations under this engagement. Is bank guarantee sufficient to fulfill this requirement?

Response: **While a waiver is granted for the submission of audited financial statements, the Authority does require financial statements of the last three years of the organization's year-end. A bank guarantee can be provided in addition to financial statements for the last three years but not in place of.**

31. Question: Does the RFP allow competing ERP vendors to submit proposals for review and down selection?

Response: **No, the Authority will only accept proposals for Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central.**

32. Question: Would the Authority entertain a response proposing Dynamics 365 Finance and Supply Chain Management as an alternative Microsoft ERP solution, either as the primary proposed solution or as an alternative to Dynamics 365 Business Central?

Response: **The RFP is specifically for Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central software licensing, implementation, and support services. Offerors must submit a proposal that is responsive to the Business Central scope and requirements stated in the RFP. Dynamics 365 Finance and Supply Chain Management will not be accepted as a replacement for the required Business Central proposal.**

However, consistent with Part II, Tab N – Additional Information, an Offeror may include additional information or an alternative solution not specifically requested in the RFP if the Offeror deems it important and relevant for the Authority's consideration. Any Dynamics 365 Finance and Supply Chain Management information must be submitted only as a clearly separate optional alternate and must not replace the required Business Central response. Any such alternate must clearly identify differences in scope, licensing, implementation approach, timeline, cost, security, hosting, support, risks, assumptions, and impact to the Authority.

33. Question: Please confirm that proposers may utilize a teaming partner who is Microsoft CSP partner, whereby the Prime Contractor serves as the contracting entity and engages a qualified subcontractor (teaming partner) to support the delivery of services under the contract.

Response: **No. The Prime Contractor must be a Microsoft-authorized Cloud Solution Provider (CSP) and must provide the Business Central SaaS licensing and implementation services directly. The Authority will not permit a proposer to rely on a teaming partner or subcontractor to satisfy the CSP requirement.**

The Prime Contractor must be the contracting entity, the Microsoft CSP, and the party fully responsible for all licensing, implementation, data migration, integrations, reporting, training, support, and contract obligations. The Prime Contractor may not shift responsibility, liability, delays, defects, errors, omissions, or performance failures to a teaming partner, subcontractor, Microsoft partner, add-on provider, or third party.

34. Question: Please provide your current Dynamics GP version, modules, ISVs, customizations, integrations, database size, number of companies and transaction volume.

Response: **There are currently 3 hosted servers with our current GP vendor housing Microsoft Dynamics GP v18.5.1661, SQL Server 2019, and a domain controller/terminal server. The Authority currently has two GP companies, Gateway Parking Garage and Philadelphia Parking Authority, the databases are approximately 2.4 GB for Gateway Parking, 178 GB for PPA, and 48.5 GB for Management Reporter. The actively used GP modules**

and related tools include General Ledger, Accounts Payable, Purchase Order Processing, Workflow, Fixed Assets, Management Reporter, and Mekorma for check printing only. Accounts Receivable is not currently being used in GP. Current transaction volume is approximately 50,000 to 55,000 journal transactions, and more than 16,500 checks are currently produced. The Authority has some GP customizations; however, the selected Contractor must evaluate current customizations during discovery and recommend which customizations, if any, are required, replaced, redesigned, or retired in Business Central. Transaction volume may increase after implementation because certain functionality not currently utilized in GP is expected to be utilized in Business Central. Any additional installed-but-not-active modules, customizations, ISVs, reporting tools, or integration details must be reviewed and confirmed during discovery. A middleware integration does exist using eOne SmartConnect between GP and our HRIS (also currently undergoing some changes/migration between platforms); however, the selected Contractor must validate current-state integrations, reporting tools, ISVs, customizations, and module usage during discovery.

35. Question: Could you provide some insight into the size of your current Dynamics GP database and the data volumes we would be dealing with?

Response: See response to Question 34.

36. Question: How large is the current Dynamics GP database?

Response: See response to Question 34.

37. Question: What is the current Dynamics GP version and what modules are actively in use today and Volume of data?

Response: See response to Question 34.

38. Question: Can the Authority confirm the current version of Microsoft Dynamics GP in use? This is required to determine compatibility with available GP to BC migration tooling and to accurately scope data extraction and migration efforts.

Response: See response to Question 34.

39. Question: Can the Authority provide GP database size, table count, attachment size, company count and historical transaction volume?

Response: See response to Question 34.

40. Question: How many daily transactions is the Authority currently processing/posting in GP? Does the Authority anticipate this number growing substantially in the next 5-10 years?

Response: The Authority does not currently have a finalized daily transaction count; however, based on current annual GP activity, the Authority processes approximately 50,000 to 55,000 journal transactions and produces more than 16,500 checks. Actual daily transaction volume varies based on business activity, month-end close, payment processing, invoice processing, and reporting cycles. Transaction volume is expected to increase after Business Central implementation because certain functionality not currently utilized in GP is expected to be used in Business Central, including additional financial, reporting, workflow, project/grant, AR replacement, and related business process functionality. Offerors must describe how the proposed solution will support current and future transaction volumes, peak processing periods, scalability, system performance, reporting, integrations, and projected growth over the next 5 to 10 years.

41. Question: What is the current version/build of Microsoft Dynamics GP in use, and are there any third-party add-ons or customizations to GP that need to be accounted for in the migration scope?

Response: See response to Question 34.

42. Question: Can the Authority provide a complete inventory of all ISV add-ons, third-party modules, and customizations currently deployed within the Dynamics GP environment?

Response: See response to Question 34.

43. Question: Does the Authority have any existing integrations between GP and external platforms that are not identified in the RFP?

Response: See response to Question 34.

44. Question: Please confirm the Microsoft Dynamics GP / Great Plains modules currently implemented at PPA and identify which are actively used versus installed but not in active use. This may include General Ledger, Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable, Fixed Assets, Purchasing, Project Accounting, Bank Reconciliation, Workflow, Management Reporter, reporting tools, third-party solutions, and custom modules.

Response: See response to Question 34.

45. Question: Please confirm the number of GP companies/databases, legal entities, funds, departments, cost centers, projects, grants, and operating units currently maintained in GP.

Response: The Authority currently maintains two GP companies/databases. The number of legal entities, funds, departments, cost centers, operating units, and related financial coding values will be reviewed and confirmed during discovery. Project/Grant Management is not currently being used in GP; however, the Authority would like to use Project/Grant Management functionality in Business Central. The selected Contractor must evaluate the Authority's current GP company structure, chart of accounts, departments, cost centers, funds, operating units, financial dimensions, reporting structure, and any related coding values during discovery and recommend the appropriate Business Central structure. The Authority does not anticipate that all current GP structures or customizations will automatically be recreated in Business Central unless validated as required for operations, reporting, audit, reconciliation, or compliance needs.

46. Question: Please share GP environment details, including GP version, SQL Server version, database size, production/test environments, customizations, ISV products, integrations, reports, and unsupported or deprecated components.

Response: See response to Question 34.

47. Question: Please confirm which integration vendors, banks, payroll providers, OCR vendors, or other third parties must participate in design, testing, certification, or production cutover, and who will coordinate their availability and approvals.

Response: See response to Question 34.

48. Question: How many legal entities, funds, departments, or business units will be included in the implementation?

Response: The Authority currently maintains two GP companies/databases. The final number of legal entities, funds, departments, business units, cost centers, operating units, and related financial dimensions to be included in the Business Central implementation will be reviewed and confirmed during discovery. The selected Contractor must evaluate the Authority's current GP company structure, chart of accounts, departments, cost centers, funds, operating units, reporting structure, and related coding values and recommend the appropriate Business Central structure. The Authority does not anticipate that all current GP structures or customizations will automatically be recreated in Business Central unless validated as required for operations, reporting, audit, reconciliation, or compliance needs.

49. Question: Are multiple companies currently configured in Dynamics GP?

Response: See response to Question 48.

50. Question: What is the annual transaction volume for:

- a. Accounts Payable (AP) Invoices
- b. Accounts Receivable (AR) Invoices
- c. Purchase Orders (POs)
- d. Payments
- e. Journal Entries

Response: The Authority's annual transaction volumes can vary, and the numbers provided below are based on current volume.

- a. **Accounts Payable (AP) Invoices:** Approximately 12,881 annually
- b. **Accounts Receivable (AR) Invoices:** Approximately 24,000 annually
- c. **Purchase Orders (POs):** Approximately 850 per year
- d. **Payments:** More than 16,500 checks currently produced annually
- e. **Journal Entries:** Approximately 50,000 to 55,000 journal transactions annually

51. Question: What version of Dynamics GP is currently in use?

Response: See response to Question 34.

52. Question: How many GP databases currently exist?

Response: See response to Question 34.

53. Question: Please list all Dynamics GP customizations.

Response: See response to Question 34.

54. Question: Are any Independent Software Vendor (ISV) solutions installed?

Response: See response to Question 34.

55. Question: Please list all third-party applications integrated with Dynamics GP?

Response: See response to Question 34.

56. Question: How many active vendors exist?

Response: The Authority currently has 628 active vendors.

57. Question: Please identify all systems that exchange data with Dynamics GP.

System	Purpose	Real-Time or Batch
Banking		
Payroll		
HR		
Parking Management		
Citation Processing		

Permit Management		
Revenue Management		
Document Management		
Other		

Response: The Authority is not aware of any existing external systems that directly exchange data with Dynamics GP beyond the GP-related tools and products identified in the RFP, including Management Reporter and Mekorma for check printing. The selected Contractor must validate current-state integrations, data exchanges, reporting tools, ISVs, customizations, file imports/exports, and any related GP interfaces during discovery. Any confirmed integrations or data exchanges must be documented and evaluated to determine whether they are required, replaced, redesigned, retired, or addressed through Business Central functionality.

58. Question: What business transactions must be integrated between systems?

Response:

- Chart of Accounts
- Division, Department, Cost Centers
- Beginning Account Balances
- Historical general ledger transactions
- Budgets
- Vendor Master Records
- Open Invoices
- Open Credits
- Vendor Payment history
- 1099 information
- Asset master records
- Acquisition costs
- Accumulated Depreciation
- Remaining Useful lives
- Depreciation history
- Bank Account Information
- Outstanding Checks/Deposits
- Bank reconciliation data necessary for go-live
- ACH files
- Positive Pay Files

- **Bank Statement Imports**
- **Wire transfer information**
- **Invoice imaging**
- **Approval Workflows**
- **Budget imports**
- **Actual to Budget reporting feeds**

59. Question: Are any GP modules customized?

Response: The Authority will not provide a full inventory of GP module customizations before proposal submission.

Offerors must assume that GP may include configurations, reports, workflows, data structures, manual processes, or other items that require review during discovery. The Contractor must include discovery and validation in its implementation scope to identify any GP customizations, determine whether they are still required, and recommend the appropriate Business Central future-state approach.

The Authority does not intend to automatically recreate all GP customizations in Business Central. Any required functionality must be validated with the Authority and delivered through Business Central configuration, approved customization, Microsoft ecosystem tools, reporting tools, or other approved solution components. Offerors must describe their approach for identifying, documenting, evaluating, redesigning, and replacing any required GP customizations as part of the Business Central implementation.

60. Question: Which customizations must be retained in Business Central?

Response: The Authority will not identify a final list of GP customizations to be retained before proposal submission. The Authority expects to modernize and redesign processes in Business Central rather than automatically recreate existing GP customizations.

The Contractor must review current customizations during discovery, validate any required functionality with the Authority, and recommend the appropriate Business Central approach. Customization must only be used when approved by the Authority and when the requirement cannot be met through configuration, Microsoft tools, reporting, integrations, or other approved solution components.

61. Question: Which customizations can be retired or replaced with standard Business Central functionality?

Response: The Authority will not identify a final list of GP customizations to be retired or replaced before proposal submission.

The Contractor must review current customizations during discovery and recommend which items can be retired, replaced with standard Business Central functionality, addressed through configuration, or supported through approved Microsoft tools or reporting capabilities.

The Authority expects configuration and standard Business Central functionality to be prioritized over customization wherever feasible.

62. Question: Is Dynamics GP deployed on-premises, hosted, or cloud-based?

Response: Currently we are in a hosted environment.

63. Question: Are test, development, or training environments available?

Response: The selected Contractor must provide and configure the required Business Central environments as part of the implementation. At a minimum, the solution must include Production, Sandbox/UAT, and Development or development-equivalent environments. Offerors must describe the proposed environment

strategy, including whether separate training environments are recommended or whether training will be conducted using Sandbox/UAT or another approved non-production environment. Offerors must identify environment setup, refresh process, access controls, data protection, security, licensing, cost impacts, and how each environment will support configuration, testing, training, UAT, and deployment activities.

64. Question: Will the Authority provide a current-state inventory of:

- a. GP modules
- b. Integrations
- c. Reports
- d. Customizations
- e. Interfaces
- f. Workflow configurations
- g. Security roles/users

Response: The Authority does not intend to provide a complete current-state inventory before proposal submission.

The Authority expects to modernize and redesign processes in Business Central rather than directly replicate all existing GP configurations, reports, workflows, customizations, interfaces, security roles, or manual processes. Offerors must include discovery and requirements validation as part of their implementation approach.

During discovery, the Contractor must review the current-state environment where necessary, validate business requirements with the Authority, identify what must be migrated or recreated, and recommend the appropriate future-state Business Central design. Offerors must identify the information needed from the Authority, timing of requests, assumptions, dependencies, and any impact on schedule or cost.

Available current-state information may be provided during discovery, but Offerors must not assume that a complete current-state inventory will be provided before proposal submission.

65. Question: Please indicate which Dynamics GP modules are currently active?

Module	In Use (Y/N)
General Ledger	
Accounts Payable	
Accounts Receivable	
Fixed Assets	
Bank Reconciliation	
Purchase Order Processing	
Inventory	
Project Accounting	
Grant Management	
Payroll	

Analytical Accounting	
Multicurrency	
Electronic Banking	
Field Service	
Other (Specify)	

Response: See response to Question 64.

66. Question: Are VBA modifications currently used?

Response: The Authority will not identify a final list of VBA modifications before proposal submission.

Offerors must assume that VBA modifications, macros, reports, or other legacy GP-related customizations may exist and must be reviewed during discovery. The Contractor must identify any VBA modifications in use, determine whether the related business requirement is still needed, and recommend the appropriate Business Central replacement approach.

The Authority does not intend to recreate VBA modifications in Business Central. Required functionality must be addressed through standard Business Central functionality, configuration, approved customization, Microsoft tools, reporting capabilities, or other approved solution components.

67. Question: Are Dexterity customizations currently used?

Response: The Authority will not identify a final list of Dexterity customizations before proposal submission.

Offerors must assume that Dexterity customizations or other legacy GP-related customizations may exist and must be reviewed during discovery. The Contractor must identify any Dexterity customizations in use, determine whether the related business requirement is still needed, and recommend the appropriate Business Central replacement approach.

The Authority does not intend to recreate Dexterity customizations in Business Central. Required functionality must be addressed through standard Business Central functionality, configuration, approved customization, Microsoft tools, reporting capabilities, or other approved solution components.

68. Question: Are there any GP Report Writer, SmartList, or Management Reporter customizations currently in use that will need to be replicated in Business Central?

Response: Yes. GP Report Writer, SmartList, Management Reporter reports, and other legacy reporting customizations are currently in use. The Authority requires all current reports to be reviewed, retained, replaced, or redesigned in Business Central or an approved reporting tool. The Contractor must review current GP reporting customizations during discovery, identify each current report, validate the business purpose and required fields, and recommend the appropriate Business Central reporting approach. Reports must be addressed through standard Business Central reports, configuration, Power BI, Excel-based reporting, custom reports, or other approved reporting tools. The Authority does not require every legacy report to be recreated in the exact same GP format; however, the replacement solution must preserve the required reporting functionality, data, filters, outputs, and audit/business purpose of all current reports. Final report format, layout, tool, prioritization, and inclusion in the required custom report scope will be confirmed during discovery and requirements validation.

- 69. Question:** Can the Authority confirm the names of its primary banking platform or treasury management system, and whether that platform supports standard file-based integration formats such as NACHA and Positive Pay, or whether API-based connectivity is available?
- Response:** TD and Santander on-line platforms are utilized, and both support NACHA and Positive Pay.
- 70. Question:** What are the specific banking and treasury platforms currently in use?
- Response:** TD and Santander on-line platforms are utilized.
- 71. Question:** Which banking platforms are used for bank feeds, ACH, Positive Pay and reconciliation?
- Response:** All uploaded to the banks for all processes. See response to question 69.
- 72. Question:** Which banks require Positive Pay, ACH, NACHA and payment file integration?
- Response:** TD and Santander.
- 73. Question:** Is Positive Pay currently utilized?
- Response:** Yes.
- 74. Question:** Please provide details of required banking/treasury integrations, including bank feeds, ACH/NACHA, Positive Pay, payment files, lockbox, cash receipts, bank reconciliation, payment status updates, file formats, frequency, and security requirements?
- Response:** All of the ACH and positive pay files are standard bank format files for uploading.
- 75. Question:** What banking and treasury management platforms does the Authority currently use that will require integration with BC (for NACHA, Positive Pay, bank feeds)?
- Response:** We use Great Plains currently and that produces all of the file formats required by the banks.
- 76. Question:** What are the AP approval thresholds, approver roles and escalation rules?
- Response:** The Authority's current approval thresholds, approver roles, and escalation rules will be reviewed during implementation. The proposed solution must support configurable, multi-level approval workflows based on transaction type, dollar thresholds, department, division, user role, and delegation of authority.
- 77. Question:** Are AP approval workflows currently automated?
- Response:** The Authority currently utilizes automated workflow processes within Great Plains for requisition approvals only. The proposed offeror must describe the configurable system-based workflow capabilities supporting the procure-to-pay process, including approval hierarchies, delegation of authority, audit trails, escalation procedures, automated notifications, and electronic approvals.
- The Offeror must describe how existing procurement, purchasing, and accounts payable workflows will be migrated, replicated, enhanced, or replaced within the solution. The response must identify any workflow functionality that is not available in the standard solution and describe any required customizations, third-party applications, or additional licensing necessary to achieve the Authority's workflow requirements.
- 78. Question:** How many approval levels exist within AP workflows?
- Response:** The Offeror must support configurable, multi-level approval workflows. Approval routing must be based on configurable criteria including dollar thresholds, department, division, account coding, user role, and delegation of authority. The Offeror must support at least 5 configurable approval levels and identify any limitations on the number of approval levels supported.
- 79. Question:** Are 1099 and W-9 processes currently managed in GP or a separate tool?
- Response:** All in Great Plains.

- 80. Question:** Regarding Section IV-B.2 and B.6, what duplicate vendor and duplicate payment rules should be enforced?
- Response:** **Duplicate Vendor: Block duplicate vendors based on EIN, warning for similar vendor names, addresses, email or phone number.**
- Duplicate payment rules: Invoice number cannot be duplicated with the same vendor, warning for same vendor-invoice date-invoice amount.**
- 81. Question:** Does the Authority currently use Power BI, and if so, what workspaces, licenses, gateways and governance standards are in place?
- Response: No, only in test/experimental attempts, however, we are open to reviewing proposed vendor solutions and possibilities for future integration paths that might be available.**
- 82. Question:** Are there existing API security standards, IP allow listing, VPN, SFTP or certificate requirements?
- Response: No current API security standards policy at the moment; we have IP allow listing capability, if needed. With regards to VPN/SFTP/certificates, seeking vendor recommendations as required to meet aforementioned SOC compliance etc.**
- 83. Question:** Regarding Section IV-C through C.6, how many vendors are active and inactive in the current vendor master?
- Response: Over 17,000, the Authority does not mark any vendors as inactive in the GP System.**
- 84. Question:** Regarding Section IV-B.4, how many fixed assets are currently maintained and what asset classes are used?
- Response: Over 250 all equipment and autos/light trucks.**
- 85. Question:** Regarding Section IV-B.4, which depreciation methods and useful life policies are required?
- Response: Straight line ½ year in of acquisition and ½ in retirement.**
- 86. Question:** Regarding Section IV-B.4, are leases currently managed in GP, spreadsheets or a third-party system?
- Response: Leases are managed by LeaseCrunch software.**
- 87. Question:** Regarding Section IV-B.4, how many active leases and subscription arrangements require GASB 87 and GASB 96 tracking?
- Response: GASB 87 = 35 GASB 96 = 7.**
- 88. Question:** Regarding Section IV-B.4, are audit-ready asset roll-forward reports currently available, or must they be designed from scratch?
- Response: All currently in Excel.**
- 89. Question:** How many AP invoices are processed monthly and annually?
- Response: The Authority processed approximately 12,881 accounts payable invoices through Microsoft GP during the most recent fiscal year, representing an average of approximately 1,073 invoices per month. This total reflects invoices paid by check and does not include invoices paid via ACH or wire transfer.**
- 90. Question:** What is the annual AP invoice volume?
- Response: See response to Question 89.**
- 91. Question:** What is the annual payment volume?

Response: The Authority processed approximately 8,867 check payments through Microsoft GP during the most recent fiscal year. This equates to an average of approximately 739 check payments per month. This total does not include payments made via ACH, wire transfer, or other electronic payment methods.

92. Question: How many vendors are paid via ACH?

Response: The Authority does not currently process ACH vendor payments through Microsoft Dynamics GP. As a result, the number of vendors paid via ACH within the ERP system is not applicable.

93. Question: What invoice intake channels are used today: email, portal, paper, scanned PDF, EDI or manual entry?

Response: The Authority currently receives vendor invoices through a combination of email, paper mail, and scanned PDF documents and are entered manually in the current ERP system. The Authority does not currently utilize a vendor invoice portal or EDI for invoice intake.

94. Question: Can the Authority provide the current Chart of Accounts structure, segment definitions, funds, departments, projects, grants and dimensions?

Response: The Authority's current Chart of Accounts structure, segment definitions, and related financial dimensions will not be distributed as part of the RFP. Offerors should assume a multi-division financial environment with departmental and reporting segment requirements.

Detailed Chart of Accounts information will be made available to the selected Offeror during the discovery and implementation phases.

The Authority maintains multiple divisions, department reporting, interfund accounting, and budget reporting requirements.

95. Question: Please share the current Chart of Accounts structure and confirm whether PPA expects to retain it, redesign it, or map it to a new Business Central dimension model?

Response: The Authority's current Chart of Accounts structure will not be distributed as part of the RFP process.

The Authority expects the selected Offeror to evaluate the existing Chart of Accounts structure and provide recommendations regarding retention, optimization, redesign, and/or mapping to Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central dimensions as part of the discover and implementation process.

Offerors should assume that the Authority maintains a multi-division financial environment with departmental reporting, interfund accounting, budgetary reporting, and other financial reporting requirements. The solution must support these requirements while preserving the Authority's ability to meet operational, financial, management reporting, and audit needs.

Offerors should describe their recommended approach for evaluating, migrating, and mapping the existing Chart of Accounts and reporting structure to the proposed Business Central environment.

96. Question: How many account segments exist within the Chart of Accounts?

Response: 3,101.

97. Question: How many active GL accounts currently exist?

Response: 2,872.

98. Question: Will the Chart of Accounts be redesigned as part of the implementation?

Response: Potentially, yes.

99. Question: Can the Authority provide current process maps for finance, AP, AR, procurement and grant/project accounting?

Response: The Authority does not maintain comprehensive process maps. Existing procedures, workflows, and supporting documentation will be made available to the selected Offeror during the discovery phase as appropriate.

The selected Offeror will be responsible for conducting discovery sessions and documenting current-state and future-state business processes as part of the implementation.

100. Question: How many legal entities, funds, departments or inter-company/inter-fund structures must be supported?

Response: We have 22 entities as of this date.

101. Question: What are the current budgeting and forecasting processes, tools and approval workflows?

Response: The Authority currently utilizes a combination of Microsoft Dynamics GP, Management Reporter, Microsoft Excel, and internally developed budget workbooks to support its budgeting and forecasting processes.

The annual budget process includes the development of departmental and divisional budgets, review by Finance, management review, executive review, and approval by the Authority's Board. Periodic forecasts and budget-to-actual analyses are performed throughout the fiscal year to support financial management and decision-making.

Budget submissions, reviews, revisions, and approvals are currently managed through a combination of spreadsheets, electronic communications, and management review processes. The Authority is interested in understanding how the proposed solution can improve budget development, forecasting, workflow management, collaborations, approvals, version control, reporting, and auditability.

102. Question: Are grant budgets and project budgets managed in Dynamics GP today or outside the ERP?

Response: Some are managed in Great Plains and some are managed manually.

103. Question: Regarding Section IV-B.3, what collections workflows, aging rules and dunning processes are required?

Response: The Authority requires AR aging, collections tracking, payment reconciliation, and reporting capabilities in the replacement solution. The solution must support multiple operational identifiers and payment sources. Specific aging buckets, collection workflows, notices, escalation rules, and dunning processes will be finalized during implementation. Offerors should recommend Business Central-compatible functionality or add-ons that can support collections management, aging, dunning, payment tracking, reconciliation, and exception reporting.

104. Question: Regarding Section IV-B.3, what AR billing streams exist today, such as parking, permits, citations, badge fees, leases, airport parking, taxicab or other revenue types?

Response: The Authority currently uses a custom Accounts Receivable reconciliation program that was built for the Authority and is separate from Microsoft Dynamics GP. This program must be replaced as part of this RFP. Payments are received through a banking platform and reconciled through the current AR reconciliation process. Offerors should assume that AR activity may come from multiple operational and banking sources and should recommend Business Central-compatible functionality, add-ons, integrations, or reporting tools that can replace the current AR reconciliation program and support the Authority's billing, payment matching, reconciliation, and reporting needs.

105. Question: Regarding Section IV-B.3, are invoices generated directly from GP today or imported from operational systems?

Response: The Authority currently uses a separate custom AR reconciliation program that must be replaced through this RFP. Invoices are not generated or imported to GP. Invoices are physically created in both the banking platform and the AR program. Payments are received through the banking platform and reconciled in the AR program. The replacement solution must also support the ability to generate email invoices from the proposed Business Central-compatible AR solution. Offerors must describe the recommended Business Central approach, including any add-ons, integrations, data imports, invoice emailing capabilities, payment matching, reconciliation processes, or reporting tools needed to replace the current AR reconciliation program and support invoice creation, invoice delivery, payment receipt, and reconciliation.

106. Question: Regarding Section IV-B.3, which operational identifiers must be stored against AR customers and transactions: plate number, permit number, badge number, citation number or others?

Response: The replacement solution must support storage, search, reconciliation, and reporting of operational identifiers associated with AR customers, invoices, payments, and transactions. Required identifiers include, but are not limited to, license plate numbers, customer codes, RFID Tag numbers of at least 20 characters both letters and numbers, proxy card numbers, invoice numbers, transaction batches, locations, and transaction amounts. Offerors must describe how these identifiers can be stored, searched, reported, exported, and used for reconciliation and audit purposes.

107. Question: Does the Authority currently use Microsoft SharePoint for document management or attachment storage? If so, is SharePoint already integrated with Dynamics GP, or are attachments and supporting documents stored separately, for example, on network drives or within GP itself? Understanding the current document storage landscape will allow us, Offerors, to accurately scope the migration of attachments and documents into the Business Central and SharePoint environment. Additionally, can the Authority confirm what is the current Dynamics GP database size.

Response: The Authority currently uses MS Sharepoint but no integration exists with Dynamics GP. All GP related documents/attachments are stored within GP on hosted servers. See response to Question 34 for additional details.

108. Question: The RFP requires migration of Workflow Configurations from Dynamics GP to Business Central. Given that GP and BC workflow architectures differ fundamentally, will the Authority provide documented specifications of current approval workflows prior to contract award, or is discovery, documentation, and redesign of existing workflows included within the contractor's implementation scope?

Response: The Authority does not intend to provide formal documented specifications of all current GP approval workflows prior to contract award.

Discovery, documentation, validation, and redesign of existing workflows must be included within the Contractor's implementation scope. Offerors must not assume that GP workflow configurations can be migrated directly into Business Central. The Contractor must review the current-state workflows where applicable, validate Authority business requirements, identify required approval paths, roles, thresholds, exceptions, audit requirements, and segregation-of-duties controls, and recommend the appropriate future-state workflow design in Business Central.

Available current-state workflow information may be provided during discovery. However, the selected Contractor must be responsible for documenting, designing, configuring, testing, and obtaining Authority approval of the final Business Central workflows.

109. Question: Are workflow diagrams mandatory for proposal submission, or only "if available" as stated in the document?

Response: Workflow diagrams are not mandatory at proposal submission if they are not available.

Offerors must provide clear process descriptions for applicable workflows, including approvals, routing, exceptions, roles, responsibilities, and system touchpoints. If workflow diagrams are available, Offeror must include them in their proposal.

The selected Offeror must develop and finalize detailed workflow documentation and diagrams during implementation as part of requirements validation, future-state design, configuration, testing, and knowledge transfer.

110. Question: Please summarize the current monthly, quarterly, and annual close process, including major tasks, approvals, reconciliations, target timelines, and key bottlenecks.

Response: The Authority's financial close process includes monthly, quarterly, and annual closing activities designed to support internal financial reporting, budget monitoring, external reporting requirements, and the annual financial statement audit.

Major close activities include, but are not limited to:

- Recording recurring and non-recurring journal entries
- Payroll imports and payroll related accruals
- Accounts payable and accounts receivable review
- Cash reconciliations and bank reconciliations
- Interfund reconciliations and balancing
- Fixed asset additions, disposals, and depreciation
- Accruals and other adjusting entries
- Budget-to-Actual analysis
- Financial Statement preparation and management review
- Quarterly and year-end reporting requirements
- Annual audit support and financial statement preparation.

The close process involves review and approval by Finance management and other designated personnel, as appropriate. Monthly and quarterly closes are generally completed in accordance with internal reporting requirements, while the annual close is coordinated with the Authority's external auditors and financial reporting deadlines.

Offerors should assume a multi-divisional environment with departmental reporting, interfund accounting, budgetary reporting, and audit requirements. The proposed solution should support workflow management, reconciliations, approvals, financial reporting, audit readiness, and efficient period-end close processes.

Detailed close procedures, timelines, and supporting documentation will be made available to the selected Offeror during the discovery and implementation phases.

The Authority's target monthly close is generally completed within 15-20 days following month-end with quarterly and annual close activities requiring additional review, reconciliation and audit-related procedures.

111. Question: Please summarize the current Accounts Payable process from invoice intake through approval, matching, payment, 1099 reporting, W-9 tracking, ACH enrollment, duplicate prevention, and audit review. Please include approximate monthly volume and exception scenarios.

Response: The Authority maintains a formal Accounts Payable process that includes invoice receipt, review, approval, payment processing, vendor maintenance, regulatory reporting, and audit support activities. Detailed process documentation will be reviewed with the selected Offeror during discovery and implementation.

At a high level, the Accounts Payable process includes:

- Receipt of invoices through various channels, including electronic and manual submissions
- Review and approval in accordance with established purchasing, procurement, and payment authorization procedures
- Matching and validation activities, as applicable, including invoice, purchase order, contract, and receiving documentation review
- Accounts Payable data entry and processing
- Check, ACH, wire, and other approved payment processing methods
- Vendor onboarding and maintenance activities, including W-9 collection and validation
- 1099 reporting and regulatory compliance activities
- Duplicate invoice review and payment controls
- Audit trail maintenance and supporting documentation retention
- Month-end, year-end, and audit support activities

The Authority currently processes approximately 12,881 invoices annually through Microsoft Dynamics GP via check processing. Additional invoices may be processed through ACH, wire, or other payment methods.

The selected Offeror will be expected to conduct detailed discovery sessions to document current-state processes, identify exceptions and control requirements, evaluate workflow opportunities, and recommend improvements utilizing standard Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central functionality wherever practical.

Offerors should assume that the Accounts Payable process includes approval workflows, internal controls, segregation of duties requirements, audit trail requirements, vendor management activities, exception handling, and compliance reporting obligations.

- 112. Question:** Please summarize the current Accounts Receivable process, including billing, invoicing, cash receipts, aging, collections, adjustments, write-offs, reconciliation, and use of operational identifiers such as license plate, badge, permit, or citation references?

Response: The Authority currently uses a separate custom Accounts Receivable reconciliation program that is not part of Dynamics GP and must be replaced through this RFP. Accounts Receivable is not currently being used in Dynamics GP. Invoices are created in both the banking platform and the custom AR program. Payments are received through the banking platform and reconciled in the AR program. The replacement solution must support invoice creation, invoice emailing, cash receipts, payment matching, reconciliation, reporting, and audit support.

The replacement solution must also support storage, search, reconciliation, and reporting of operational identifiers associated with AR customers, invoices, payments, and transactions. Required identifiers include, but are not limited to, license plate numbers, customer codes, RFID/AVI/EGO tag numbers, proxy card numbers, invoice numbers, transaction batches, locations, and transaction amounts.

Aging, collections, adjustments, write-offs, dunning processes, and related workflows must be reviewed and finalized during discovery and requirements validation. Offerors must describe the recommended Business Central-compatible approach, including any add-ons, integrations, data imports, payment matching tools,

reconciliation processes, invoice delivery capabilities, reporting tools, assumptions, limitations, and related costs required to replace the current AR reconciliation program.

113. Question: Regarding Accounts Receivable, how many active customers exist?

Response: The exact number of active Accounts Receivable customers will be confirmed during discovery.

Accounts Receivable is not currently being used in Dynamics GP. The Authority currently uses a separate custom AR reconciliation program that must be replaced through this RFP. Offerors must assume that AR customer data from the current AR program and related billing/payment sources will require review, cleansing, validation, migration or conversion, and reporting support. Offerors must describe their approach for identifying active customers, inactive customers, customer codes, operational identifiers, duplicate records, billing records, payment history, and related AR data needed for the replacement solution in their proposal.

114. Question: Regarding Accounts Receivable, what is the annual customer invoice volume?

Response: The exact annual Accounts Receivable customer invoice volume will be confirmed during discovery.

Accounts Receivable is not currently being used in Dynamics GP. The Authority currently creates invoices in both the banking platform and the custom AR reconciliation program, which must be replaced through this RFP. Offerors must assume that invoice volume may include recurring invoices, customer codes, invoice numbers, locations, amounts, transaction batches, and operational identifiers such as license plate numbers, RFID/AVI/EGO tag numbers, and proxy card numbers.

Offerors must describe the recommended Business Central-compatible approach for invoice creation, recurring billing, invoice emailing, data imports, payment matching, reconciliation, reporting, validation, and migration or conversion of applicable invoice data in their proposal.

115. Question: Regarding Accounts Receivable, what is the annual cash receipt volume?

Response: The exact annual Accounts Receivable cash receipt volume will be confirmed during discovery.

Accounts Receivable is not currently being used in Dynamics GP. The Authority currently receives payments through the banking platform and reconciles cash receipts in the custom AR reconciliation program, which must be replaced through this RFP. Offerors must assume that cash receipt volume may include multiple payment sources, transaction batches, customer codes, invoice numbers, locations, amounts, and operational identifiers. Offerors must describe the recommended Business Central-compatible approach for importing, processing, matching, reconciling, reporting, and validating cash receipts, including any add-ons, integrations, data imports, assumptions, limitations, and related costs in their proposal.

116. Question: Regarding Accounts Receivable, are recurring invoices utilized?

Response: Yes. Recurring invoices are utilized in Accounts Receivable.

The replacement AR solution must support recurring invoice creation, invoice emailing, billing schedules, customer codes, operational identifiers, payment tracking, reconciliation, reporting, and audit support. Offerors must describe the recommended Business Central-compatible approach for recurring invoices, including any required configuration, add-ons, integrations, data imports, billing frequency options, invoice delivery capabilities, assumptions, limitations, and related costs in their proposal.

117. Question: Regarding Accounts Receivable, are collections workflows required?

Response: Yes. Collections workflows are required for Accounts Receivable.

The replacement AR solution must support aging, collections tracking, payment follow-up, adjustments, write-offs, notes, statuses, reporting, and audit support. Specific collections workflows, aging buckets, escalation rules, dunning notices, approval requirements, and write-off processes must be reviewed and finalized during discovery and requirements validation. Offerors must describe the recommended Business Central-compatible

approach, including any add-ons, configurations, workflows, reporting tools, assumptions, limitations, and related costs needed to support AR collections management in their proposal.

118. Question: Please summarize the current requisition-to-PO process, including requisition creation, budget validation, approval routing, PO generation, change orders, receiving, invoice matching, thresholds, and exception handling.

Response: The Authority utilizes a structured requisition-to-PO process consisting of requisition creation, two levels of approval, PO generation, receiving, invoice matching, and two-step invoice approval prior to Accounts Payable payment.

119. Question: Are there any significant customizations or non-standard data structures in your existing GP system that we should consider during migration?

Response: The Authority uses GP reports, SmartLists, Management Reporter reports, and other legacy reporting customizations that must be considered during migration and future-state reporting design. The Authority will not provide a final inventory of all customizations or non-standard data structures before proposal submission. The Contractor must include discovery and validation in its implementation scope to identify any GP customizations, reporting customizations, non-standard data structures, workflows, attachments, notes, audit history, and related business requirements that may impact migration. The Contractor must evaluate each item and recommend whether it must be migrated, redesigned, replaced with standard Business Central functionality, addressed through configuration, supported through approved reporting tools, or retired with Authority approval.

120. Question: Regarding Procurement and Purchasing, how many requisitions are created annually?

Response: Over 1,100.

121. Question: Regarding Procurement and Purchasing, how many approvers participate in procurement workflows?

Response: 22.

122. Question: Regarding Procurement and Purchasing, how many procurement approval levels exist?

Response: PO approval – 2, Invoice approval – 2.

123. Question: Regarding Procurement and Purchasing, is budget validation currently enforced during procurement processes?

Response: Not in Microsoft Dynamics GP.

124. Question: Regarding Procurement and Purchasing, what is the annual Purchase Order volume?

Response: 1150.

125. Question: Regarding Procurement and Purchasing, how many active contracts are managed?

Response: Contracts are not currently managed in GP. The number of contracts will depend on the functionality of the solution provided.

126. Question: Regarding Procurement and Purchasing, is three-way matching required for all purchases?

Response: Refer to Part IV-2.C.3.c of the Work Statement within the RFP.

127. Question: Regarding Procurement and Purchasing, is self-service vendor onboarding required?

Response: Refer to Part IV-2.C.1 of the Work Statement within the RFP.

128. Question: Regarding Procurement and Purchasing, is electronic document submission required?

Response: Refer to Part IV-2.C.1.b of the Work Statement within the RFP.

129. Question: Please summarize the current requisition-to-PO process, including requisition creation, budget validation, approval routing, PO generation, change orders, receiving, invoice matching, thresholds, and exception handling.

Response: Requisition → Approval → Solicit Quotes → Final Approval → Purchase Order → Delivery & Receipt → Invoice processing → to AP for Payment

130. Question: What is the size of the data for the migration?

Response: The Authority is still finalizing the exact size of the data to be migrated. At minimum, Offerors should assume migration will include master data, open transactions, beginning balances, and selected historical data. Vendors should describe their recommended migration approach, assumptions, tools, data mapping process, and any limitations based on the volume and format of the source data. See response to Question 34 for additional details.

131. Question: Please provide approximate migration volume, including GP database size, number of companies, years of data, GL entries, AP invoices, AR invoices, vendors, customers, POs, fixed assets, attachments, report definitions, and custom tables?

Response: See response to Question 130.

132. Question: How many GP companies or databases must be migrated?

Response: Two company databases. See response to Question 34 for additional details.

133. Question: Can the Authority confirm: (a) whether a data quality or data profiling assessment has previously been performed, (b) approximate volume of known data quality issues (e.g., duplicate vendors, inactive GL accounts with balances, unreconciled open items), and (c) whether data cleansing is expected to occur in GP before the migration runs, or in BC after migration? The answer directly affects the pre-migration preparation effort and project timeline?

Response: The Authority is not aware of any data issues at this time, the selected Offeror shall perform data quality checks during discovery, pre-migration. The Authority presumes all data cleansing shall occur pre-migration in GP.

134. Question: Are there any known GP data quality issues, such as duplicate vendors/customers, inactive records, missing tax IDs, incomplete historical records, unreconciled balances, orphan records, or inconsistent Chart of Accounts usage?

Response: See response to Question 133.

135. Question: Are there any known performance issues, data quality issues, or technical limitations in the current GP system that we should account for?

Response: The Authority is not aware of any material system performance issues that significantly impair day-to-day operations within the current Microsoft Dynamics GP environment.

As with any long-standing enterprise system, the Authority anticipates that opportunities may exist to improve data quality, reporting efficiency, process standardization, master data management, integrations, and overall system utilization. These areas will be evaluated during discovery, data migration planning, and implementation activities.

The Authority expects the selected Offeror to perform appropriate assessments of:

- Data quality and data readiness
- Master data governance
- Historical data migration requirements

- Customizations and integrations
- Reporting structures and requirements
- System configuration and business process alignment

Offerors should assume that standard data validation, cleansing, reconciliation, and migration activities will be required as part of the implementation. Any significant data quality concerns, technical limitations, or migration risks identified during discovery should be documented and communicated to the Authority with recommended remediation approaches.

136. Question: Are there known data quality issues in GP, such as duplicate vendors, inactive customers, invalid accounts or incomplete purchase orders?

Response: The Authority is not currently aware of any material data quality issues that would prevent migration; however, potential issues common to mature ERP systems, such as inactive records, duplicate records, outdated master data, and historical transaction inconsistencies, may exist and will be evaluation during the discovery and migration phases.

137. Question: Which historical data must be operationally available in Business Central versus available through a read-only archive or Power BI reporting model?

Response: We have data from our fiscal year 2018 which is 1APR17 to 31MAR18. The Authority would like to keep all years and prefers the historical data to be operationally available in Business Central.

138. Question: What data cleansing responsibility will sit with the Authority versus the Contractor?

Response: Data cleansing will be a shared responsibility. The Authority will be responsible for reviewing and approving source data, making business decisions about inactive, duplicate, incomplete, or incorrect records, and providing corrected data where needed. The Contractor will be responsible for identifying data quality issues during profiling and migration, providing data cleansing templates or recommendations, mapping data to the new system, loading the data, and reporting exceptions. Final data approval remains with the Authority.

139. Question: Can the Authority confirm: (a) whether the GP SQL Server is hosted on-premises or in a hosted/cloud environment, (b) the SQL Server version and instance type (named or default), and (c) whether the Authority's IT team can provide the necessary network access (firewall rules, SQL credentials, and VPN if required) to allow the BC sandbox environment to connect to the GP database?

Response: (a) and (b) See response to Question 34. (c) The Authority's IT department does not directly manage the hosted environment housing Dynamics GP/SQL. All GP access related requests made by the selected Offeror shall be reviewed by The Authority. If the request is deemed appropriate and necessary, The Authority shall submit a support ticket to the current GP vendor for implementation.

140. Question: Does the Authority currently utilize any Independent Software Vendor (ISV) or add-alternate solutions or third-party modules integrated with Microsoft Dynamics GP? If so, can the Authority provide a list of these ISVs and confirm whether equivalent functionality will be required within the Business Central environment, or whether these solutions will be retired as part of the migration?

Response: The only one the Authority has is Mekorma for check printing, but that will become obsolete due to ACH processing.

141. Question: What ISV products, third-party tools, custom SQL reports, SmartLists, workflows, or customizations currently exist in the GP environment?

Response: The Authority has several SmartLists and custom reports under SQL Reporting Services.

142. Question: Should we assume that historical AP, AR, GL detail, budgets, contracts, fixed assets, bank rec data, and purchase orders must all be fully converted into Business Central?

Response: Yes, Offerors must assume that historical AP, AR, GL detail, budgets, contracts, fixed assets, bank reconciliation data, and purchase orders are included in the required data migration scope.

The Contractor must migrate a minimum of seven years of historical data from Microsoft Dynamics GP to Business Central, including but not limited to chart of accounts, master data, open AP and AR transactions, general ledger balances and history, budgets, contracts, fixed assets, bank reconciliation data, and open and historical purchase orders. Offerors must describe their migration approach, including data extraction, mapping, transformation, cleansing support, loading, validation, reconciliation, audit trail considerations, treatment of historical detail, limitations, and any items that cannot be fully converted into Business Central. If any data cannot be converted directly, Offerors must propose an alternate method for retaining access, reporting, and audit support after go-live in their proposal.

143. Question: What data should be considered mandatory for migration versus acceptable for archive-only access?

Response: The Authority has not finalized its data migration strategy and expects the selected Offeror to provide recommendations as part of the discovery and implementation process.

At a minimum, the Authority anticipates migrating current master data and information necessary to support ongoing business operations, financial reporting, audit requirements, and period-to-period continuity. This may include, but is not limited to:

- Chart of Accounts and related financial dimensions
- Vendor master records
- Customer master records
- Open accounts payable transactions
- Open accounts receivable transactions
- Open purchase orders
- Active fixed assets and related balances
- Current budgets
- General ledger balances and other data required for go-live

The Authority has historical data beginning with Fiscal Year 2018, which covers April 1, 2017 through March 31, 2018, and would like to retain all available historical years. The Authority prefers that historical data be operationally available in Business Central where feasible. Historical data may be acceptable for archive-only access only if it is not required for ongoing operations and the archive, read-only environment, Power BI reporting model, or other approved reporting approach allows the Authority to satisfy reporting, audit, legal, reconciliation, inquiry, and records retention requirements. Offerors must describe their recommended approach for mandatory migration data, historical data migration, archive-only access, reporting on legacy data, limitations, assumptions, performance impacts, and ongoing access after go-live.

144. Question: Are integrations expected to be real-time, near real-time, scheduled batch or manual file-based?

Response: The Authority has not established a single integration standard for all interfaces and recognizes that different business processes may warrant different integration methods.

Offerors should assume that the Authority may require a combination of real-time, near real-time, scheduled batch, and file-based integrations depending on the business function, operational requirements, data volume, and system capabilities.

Offerors must describe their recommended integration approach for each proposed interface, including supported integrations methods, data synchronization frequency, error handling, monitoring capabilities, security controls, and any limitations or dependencies associated with the proposed solution in their proposal.

The Authority currently utilizes a combination of automated imports, exports, file-based transfers, and system integrations to support payroll, banking, reporting, and other business processes. The selected Offeror will be expected to evaluate existing integrations and recommend the most appropriate integration method for each business requirement as part of the implementation process.

145. Question: Is archiving of any historical data an option or is the expectation that it will all be put into Business Central?

Response: See response to Question 143.

146. Question: If migration of multiple years of historical data is required, is the Authority open to using a tool like eOne Popdock (<https://www.eonesolutions.com/platform/migration/data-migration/>) to make that process more efficient and reliable?

Response: Yes, as long as the Authority is able to access the data.

147. Question: The document states a minimum of seven years of historical data must be migrated. Does this mean seven fiscal years, seven calendar years, seven years plus current year, or all open and active records regardless of age? What is the volume of data size and is the data of customized functionalities data or base?

Response: Seven fiscal years. See response to Question 34 for additional details.

148. Question: How would you prefer to handle historical data—would you expect full migration of all records, or partial archival beyond a certain period?

Response: See response to Question 143.

149. Question: Please provide approximate migration volume, including GP database size, number of companies, years of data, GL entries, AP invoices, AR invoices, vendors, customers, POs, fixed assets, attachments, report definitions, and custom tables?

Response: See response to Question 147.

150. Question: What is the approximate volume of historical transactional data (number of years, record counts by module) that will need to be migrated, beyond the 7-year minimum stated?

Response: See response to Question 147.

151. Question: Can the Authority confirm: (a) the total years of historical GL, AP, AR, and PO data currently stored in GP across all modules, (b) whether the Authority intends to use the tool's full historical migration capability or limit migration to the RFP-specified 7-year minimum, and (c) whether data beyond the migration window should be archived in a read-only GP environment or in a separate archive solution?

Response: The Authority's GP historical data is available from approximately November 2017 through the present for applicable GP modules, including GL, AP, and PO data. Accounts Receivable is not currently used in GP; AR-related data is maintained through the Authority's separate custom AR reconciliation program and related banking/payment sources, which must be reviewed as part of the AR replacement scope. The Authority prefers to retain all available historical years and prefers that historical data be operationally available in Business Central where feasible, including data beyond the RFP-specified seven-year minimum. Offerors must describe whether their proposed migration approach can support full historical migration from November 2017 through go-live, including any limitations, performance considerations, storage impacts, licensing impacts, or recommended alternatives. If any data is not migrated into Business Central, Offerors must recommend whether that data must remain in a read-only GP environment, a separate archive solution, Power BI reporting

model, or another approved reporting approach that supports inquiry, reporting, audit, reconciliation, legal, and records retention requirements after go-live.

152. Question: Please confirm the required historical migration scope for the minimum seven years. Should this be full transaction-level, searchable, reportable, and reconcilable history, or is summary-level history acceptable for older periods?

Response: The Authority requires access to a minimum of seven (7) years of historical financial information to support operational, reporting, audit, legal, and records retention requirements.

The Authority has not finalized the historical data migration strategy and expects the selected Offeror to provide recommendations regarding the most appropriate approach for migrating, archiving, and accessing historical data.

Offerors must identify in their proposal the available option and associated costs for:

- Full transactions-level migration
- Summary-level migration
- Read-only archive solutions
- Reporting and inquiry access to historical data

At minimum, historical information must remain accessible, searchable, and available for reporting and audit support purposes. The Authority will evaluate proposed approaches based on functionality, usability, cost, and long-term supportability.

153. Question: What historical data must be migrated?

- a. Accounts Payable History
- b. Accounts Receivable History
- c. Purchasing History
- d. General Ledger History
- e. Other Historical Data

Response: The Authority requires the ability to access a minimum of seven (7) years of historical financial information for operational, reporting, audit, legal, and records retention purposes.

At a minimum, the following historical data categories must be addressed as part of the Offerors proposed migration and retention strategy:

- Accounts Payable History
- Purchasing History
- General Ledger History
- Fixed Asset History
- Budget and Forecast History
- Vendor and Customer Master Data
- Banking and Cash Management History, as applicable

Offerors must provide recommendations regarding the appropriate treatment of historical data, including full transaction-level migration, summary-level migration, archive solutions, and reporting access in their proposal.

Regardless of the proposed approach, historical information must remain accessible, searchable, and available to support reporting, audit and compliance requirements.

154. Question: Are closed purchase orders, closed invoices, and inactive vendor/customer records required in the target system?

Response: Yes.

155. Question: What is the expected treatment of attachments, notes, document images, and audit history from GP?

Response: Yes. The Authority requires attachments, notes, document images, audit history, and supporting documents from GP to be migrated to the new ERP where technically feasible. This includes relevant historical and current supporting documents, such as invoice attachments, approval documentation, receipts, contracts, backup support, document images, transaction notes, audit trail information, and other related files or records.

Offerors must describe their approach for migrating these items, including assumptions, file formats, source locations, mapping to related records, storage approach, searchable access, data validation, audit history treatment, limitations, and any additional costs. If any attachments, notes, document images, audit history, or supporting records cannot be migrated directly, Offerors must identify the limitation and propose an alternate approach for retaining access to the information after go-live.

156. Question: Does the Authority require attachments and supporting documents to be migrated?

Response: See response to Question 155.

157. Question: Please confirm whether migration includes attachments, audit logs, workflow history, closed POs, closed invoices, closed grants/projects, archived vendors/customers, and historical bank reconciliation records.

Response: See response to Question 155.

158. Question: Please confirm whether attachments/supporting documents must be migrated from GP or related repositories into Business Central, SharePoint, or another document system, including document types, volume, indexing, retention, and search expectations.

Response: See response to Question 155.

159. Question: Are we expected to migrate configuration settings and workflow configurations directly, or redesign them in Business Central?

Response: Configuration settings and workflow configurations must be reviewed, validated, and redesigned in Business Central where appropriate.

Offerors must not assume that existing Microsoft Dynamics GP configuration settings, workflows, approvals, security roles, or business rules can be migrated directly into Business Central without review. The Contractor must evaluate current-state configurations and workflows, identify what can be converted or replicated, and recommend Business Central best practice configurations.

The final Business Central configuration and workflow design must be based on Authority requirements, approved business processes, internal controls, segregation-of-duties requirements, approval thresholds, reporting needs, audit requirements, and system capabilities.

Offerors must describe their approach for current-state review, future-state design, configuration, workflow setup, testing, documentation, and Authority approval in their proposal.

160. Question: Will the Authority provide data owners for validation and signoff by module?

Response: Yes. The Authority will identify data owners and subject matter experts by module or functional area to support data validation and signoff.

Offerors must describe in their proposal the required Authority participation for each module, including Finance, Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable, Procurement, Fixed Assets, Banking/Treasury, reporting, and any other applicable functional areas. Offerors must also identify the expected validation activities, timing, documentation, reconciliation reports, exception review process, and signoff requirements.

Final data owner assignments, validation responsibilities, and signoff procedures will be confirmed during project planning and data migration planning.

161. Question: Which integrations are considered mandatory on day one versus deferred to later phases?

Response: The Authority has not finalized the implementation sequencing for all integrations and expects the selected Offeror to provide recommendations regarding integration prioritization, deployment strategy, dependencies, and risk considerations.

At a minimum, the Authority anticipates that business-critical integrations required to support core financial operations, transaction processing, reporting, and month-end close activities should be available at go-live. These may include:

- Payroll and HRIS integrations supporting payroll accounting and financial reporting
- Banking and cash management integrations
- Payment processing integrations required for check, ACH, wire, and reconciliation activities
- Core reporting and business intelligence integrations
- Identity and authentication integrations, as applicable

The Authority may consider phased deployment of certain non-critical integrations, advanced reporting solutions, workflow enhancements, automation initiatives, or other ancillary functionality if such an approach reduces implementation risk and supports the targeted go-live schedule.

Offerors should identify:

- Recommended day-one integrations
- Recommended phased or post-go-live integrations
- Integration dependencies and assumptions
- Risks associated with deferring specific integrations
- Business impacts of phased deployment

The Authority will evaluate proposed integration strategies based on operational requirements, implementation risk, business continuity, resource requirements, and overall project objectives.

162. Question: Can the Authority provide a full list of systems requiring integration with Business Central?

Response: The Authority has identified several systems and business processes that may require integration with Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central. These include, but are not limited to:

- Payroll and Human Resources Information Systems (HRIS)
- Banking and treasury management platforms
- Document management and workflow solutions
- Budgeting and forecasting tools
- Financial reporting solutions

- Procurement and purchasing processes
- Payment processing solutions
- Microsoft Office applications and related productivity tools

The Authority has not completed a comprehensive integration assessment and does not represent that this list is exhaustive. The selected Offeror will be expected to conduct discovery activities to identify all required integrations, interfaces, data exchanges, and reporting requirements.

Offerors should describe their approach to evaluating, designing, implementing, monitoring, and supporting integrations within the proposed Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central environment, including any required third-party applications, middleware, or licensing.

163. Question: What are the existing parking operations, citation processing, permitting, and revenue management systems that must integrate with Business Central?

Response: See “Changes to the RFP Document” section 2 of this addendum.

164. Question: Please identify all systems requiring integration, including parking operations, citation processing, permitting, revenue management, banking, Sage HRMS and Dayforce.

Response: See “Changes to the RFP Document” section 2 of this addendum.

165. Question: Will the Authority be sharing details on what their Banking and Parking/Citation systems are so that we can begin to explore and scope integration scenarios?

Response: See “Changes to the RFP Document” section 2 of this addendum. The banking systems are TD Bank, Santander and Fulton Bank.

166. Question: Can the Authority identify the specific names and versions of the parking operations, citation processing, and revenue management platforms currently in use, and confirm whether they have existing REST APIs available for integration?

Response: See “Changes to the RFP Document” section 2 of this addendum. The revenue management platform is TD Bank E-Bill system.

167. Question: For integrations between Business Central and the Authority's operational systems including parking operations, citation processing, and permitting platforms, will the Authority's existing system vendors be responsible for developing their respective integration endpoints, or is the selected BC Contractor expected to develop all integration components on both sides?

Response: The selected Business Central Contractor will need to update or initiate any integrations that are currently in place or will be required.

168. Question: Which systems support parking operations, citation processing, permitting and revenue management?

Response: See response to Question 166.

169. Question: The RFP references integration with "parking operations, citation processing, permitting systems, and revenue management platforms" — can the Authority identify the specific systems by name and confirm whether documented APIs or integration specs exist for each?

Response: See response to Question 166. Integration specs do not exist.

170. Question: It would be helpful if you could share a detailed list of systems that need to be integrated, particularly around parking operations, citations, or other related platforms?

Response: See “Changes to the RFP Document” section 2 of this addendum.

171. Question: Are existing integrations documented?

Response: See “Changes to the RFP Document” section 2 of this addendum.

172. Question: If there are other integration requirements will the Authority be naming those systems specifically?

Response: See “Changes to the RFP Document” section 2 of this addendum.

173. Question: For payroll, should we propose integration with Sage HRMS, Dayforce, or both during transition?

Response: Offerors must propose integration or data exchange with Dayforce.

The Authority currently uses Sage HRMS for payroll but is transitioning to Dayforce. For purposes of this RFP, Offerors must assume that any payroll-related integration, data exchange, reporting, or file transfer requirements will be based on Dayforce, not Sage HRMS.

Offerors must describe the recommended Business Central approach for Dayforce-related data exchange, including payroll journal entries, general ledger coding, employee or department-related financial data where applicable, file formats, frequency, validation, error handling, reconciliation controls, security, support responsibilities, assumptions, and related costs in their proposal.

174. Question: The RFP references an ongoing migration from Sage HRMS to Dayforce. Can the Authority confirm the current status of the Dayforce implementation and provide an anticipated go-live timeline? Will Dayforce be fully operational and available for integration testing prior to the BC go-live date of April 1, 2028?

Response: The Authority is transitioning from Sage HRMS to Dayforce. For purposes of this RFP, Offerors must assume that payroll-related integration, data exchange, reporting, and file transfer requirements will be based on Dayforce, not Sage HRMS.

The Authority expects Dayforce to be implemented and operational prior to the April 1, 2028 Business Central go-live date and available to support required Business Central data exchange planning and testing.

Offerors must describe the recommended approach for Dayforce-related data exchange, including payroll journal entries, general ledger coding, file formats, data mapping, testing, validation, reconciliation controls, error handling, timing, assumptions, dependencies, and related costs.

Final Dayforce data exchange requirements, testing timing, and responsibilities will be confirmed during discovery, integration planning, and project scheduling.

175. Question: Regarding the Sage HRMS-to-Dayforce payroll migration: will the selected BC vendor be expected to integrate with Sage HRMS, Dayforce, or both during the contract term — and at what phase?

Response: See response to Question 174.

176. Question: Will payroll integration target Sage HRMS, Dayforce, or both during the transition period?

Response: See response to Question 174.

177. Question: What data must flow between Business Central and payroll: GL journals, employees, departments, project codes, labor costs or payroll summaries?

Response: At a minimum, the Authority expects the payroll integration to support the transfer of payroll-related financial information necessary for accounting, reporting, budgeting, and reconciliation purposes.

The Authority anticipates that the following data elements will be required:

- General ledger journal entries
- Labor expenses by division, department, and account
- Employee deduction and benefits allocations

- **Employer Tax and benefits expenses**
- **Payroll accruals and related adjustments**
- **Department and organizational coding**
- **Payroll summary information required for financial reporting and reconciliation**

The Authority has not finalized all payroll integration requirements and expects the selected Offeror to conduct discovery activities to validate requirements and recommend an appropriate integration approach.

Offerors must describe their experience integrating payroll systems with Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central and explain how payroll-related data can be imported, validated, reconciled, and reported within the proposed solution in their proposal.

178. Question: Regarding Section IV-C through C.6, are blanket POs, recurring POs, contract POs and change orders required at go-live?

Response: Yes.

179. Question: Regarding Section IV-C through C.6, what level of three-way matching is required for goods, services and exceptions?

Response: Refer to Part IV-2.C.3.c of the Work Statement within the RFP.

180. Question: Regarding Section IV-C through C.6, does the Authority currently use a contract management system?

Response: No.

181. Question: Please confirm the required depth of contract management functionality, including repository, metadata, renewal alerts, contract-to-requisition/PO/invoice linkage, spend tracking, vendor obligations, approval workflow, versioning, and audit history.

Response: The Authority has not established prescriptive technical specifications for contract management functionality beyond the requirements set forth in the RFP. Offerors are required to describe the contract management capabilities available within their proposed solution, including the areas identified in the question.

Responses should clearly identify the extent to which the proposed solution supports functionality such as contract repository, metadata management, renewal notifications, linkage to procurement and financial transactions (e.g., requisitions, purchase orders, invoices), spend tracking, vendor obligations, approval workflows, document version control, and audit history.

Offerors must indicate whether such capabilities are native to Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central or require configuration, customization, or add-on or third-party solutions. Any add-on or third-party solution must be clearly identified and submitted as an add alternate, including all associated licensing, implementation, integration, and ongoing support costs for the full duration of the contract term.

182. Question: Regarding Section IV-C through C.6, how many active procurement contracts must be migrated?

Response: The Authority has not established a fixed number of active procurement contracts to be migrated. Contract data is not currently maintained within Microsoft Dynamics GP.

Offerors should propose their approach based on the capabilities of their solution, including any assumptions related to data migration, contract repository functionality, and implementation requirements.

183. Question: Regarding Section IV-C through C.6, is electronic sourcing mandatory for initial go-live or optional as an add alternate/future phase?

Response: It is preferred that this would be included in the initial implementation, if the add alternate is selected.

184. Question: Regarding Section IV-C through C.6, does the Authority require a true vendor self-service portal at go-live, or can onboarding be handled through internal forms and workflow initially?

Response: It is preferred that this would be included in the initial implementation.

185. Question: Regarding Section IV-C through C.6, what documents must vendors submit during onboarding, and what expiry/renewal rules apply?

Response: This will be determined post award.

186. Question: Regarding Section IV-C through C.6, what procurement categories, commodity codes and approval rules are used today?

Response: A three-digit code drives approval workflows; commodity codes are not currently utilized.

187. Question: Regarding Section IV-C through C.6, does budget validation need to be a hard stop, warning, or override with justification?

Response: The Authority requires configurable budget control functionality. The proposed solution should support multiple budget validation methods, including hard-stop controls, warning notifications, and authorized overrides with documented justification.

The Authority anticipates that budget control requirements may vary by transaction type, funding source, department, division, account, or other business rules. Accordingly, the selected Offeror will be expected to work with the Authority during discovery and implementation to configure appropriate budget validation controls and approval workflows.

Offerors must describe the available budget control options within the proposed solution, including exception handling, approval routing, audit trail capabilities, and reporting functionality in their proposal.

188. Question: Are APIs available for these external systems, or should we assume custom middleware/integration development will be required?

Response: Authority End users will require vendor recommendations with regards to APIs, hosted solutions are to be managed by the selected Offeror in their entirety.

189. Question: Are APIs currently available for these systems, or would integration require alternate approaches?

Response: See response to Question 188.

190. Question: Are APIs available for each integrated system?

Response: See response to Question 188.

191. Question: Are middleware or integration platforms currently in use?

Response: See response to Question 188.

192. Question: For each integration, is the data flow one-way and/or bi-directional?

Response: The Authority anticipates that integration requirements will vary by system and business process. Depending on the specific interface, data flows may be one-way or bi-directional.

Examples may include:

- **Payroll to Business Central: Primarily one-way financial and accounting data.**
- **Banking and treasury systems: Potentially bi-directional, including payment processing and bank statement imports.**

- **Document management and workflow systems:** Potentially bi-directional, depending on the proposed solution architecture.
- **Reporting, budgeting, and forecasting solutions:** One-way or bi-directional, depending on functional requirements.

The Authority has not finalized all integration requirements and expects the selected Offeror to conduct discovery activities to identify integration needs, data flows, synchronization requirements, and system dependencies.

Offerors must describe in their proposal their recommended integration approach for each proposed interface, including whether the integration is one-way or bi-directional, data synchronization frequency, error handling, monitoring capabilities, and any associated limitations or dependencies.

193. Question: Are there any anticipated new integrations as part of the Business Central implementation?

Response: Yes. The Authority anticipates new data exchange and replacement functionality as part of the Business Central implementation, primarily for the replacement of the current custom AR reconciliation program, banking/payment platform activity, and Dayforce-related payroll financial postings. Accounts Receivable is not currently being used in Dynamics GP. The Authority currently uses a separate custom AR reconciliation program, which must be replaced through this RFP. Payments are received through the banking platform and reconciled in the AR program.

No integrations with parking operations, citation processing, permitting, or revenue management systems are required. Any optional or future integrations recommended by the Offeror must be listed as an add alternate and include scope, assumptions, pricing, support, and maintenance costs.

194. Question: Is bank reconciliation integration expected to mean native BC capabilities only, or bank-specific direct feeds/integrations?

Response: The Authority is interested in understanding the full range of bank reconciliation capabilities available within the proposed solution.

195. Question: What level of integration is expected for Microsoft 365 and Power Platform (for example Outlook, Teams, SharePoint, Power Automate, Power BI)?

Response: The Authority has not established a prescribed level of integration between Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central and Microsoft 365 or Power Platform tools. Offerors are required to clearly identify the level of integration available within their proposed solution with respect to Microsoft 365 (including Outlook, Teams, and SharePoint) and Power Platform (including Power Automate and Power BI).

Responses should describe available functionality, including integration points, workflows, reporting capabilities, and any automation features. Offerors must also clearly indicate whether such functionality is native to Business Central or requires additional configuration, customization, licensing, or third-party solutions.

196. Question: Does the Authority prefer native Business Central APIs, Power Platform, Azure Logic Apps, Azure Functions, middleware, or existing integration platforms?

Response: The Authority prefers a Business Central solution that uses native Business Central functionality, native APIs, and Microsoft-supported tools where feasible. Offerors must recommend the appropriate integration approach, including whether native APIs, Power Platform, Azure Logic Apps, Azure Functions, middleware, or other tools are required. The Authority prefers to avoid middleware solutions that create unnecessary complexity, maintenance burden, duplicated processes, or long-term support risk. Any proposed integration approach must clearly identify functionality, costs, security controls, support responsibilities, assumptions, limitations, and ongoing maintenance requirements.

197. Question: Does the Authority already have a Microsoft 365 tenant and Azure/Entra ID environment that Business Central will join?

Response: Business Central is expected to be implemented in a separate Microsoft environment and should not be part of, or connected to, the Authority's current Microsoft environment. Offerors must describe how the separate environment will be established, managed, secured, and supported, including authentication, user provisioning, security roles, access controls, administration, licensing, and any required Microsoft 365 or Entra ID assumptions.

198. Question: Will Business Central dimensions be required?

Response: Yes. Business Central dimensions will be required. Offerors must include dimension strategy, design, validation, and configuration as part of discovery and implementation. The Contractor must work with the Authority during discovery to determine the appropriate dimension structure, including departments, locations, funds, projects/grants, procurement categories, AR identifiers, fixed assets, and other reporting needs. Final dimensions must be reviewed and approved by the Authority before configuration.

199. Question: Are there existing MFA, conditional access, privileged identity management or security baseline policies that must be followed?

Response: The Authority maintains information security policies, standards, and controls that must be adhered to by the selected Offeror. Specific security requirements, including authentication, access management, and cybersecurity controls, will be reviewed during the discovery and implementation phases.

Offerors should assume that industry-standard security controls will be required and should describe the security capabilities of the proposed solution, including but not limited to:

- Multi-factor authentication (MFA)
- Role-based access controls
- Conditional access policies
- Privileged access management
- Audit logging and monitoring
- Segregation of duties
- Data encryption in transit and at rest
- Security administration and reporting capabilities

Offerors must identify any prerequisites, limitations, or additional licensing requirements associated with these security features in their proposal.

200. Question: What role-based access model is expected for finance, procurement, approvers, executives, auditors and administrators?

Response: The Authority expects the proposed solution to support configurable role-based security and segregation of duties controls. Specific security roles and permissions will be finalized during the discovery and implementation phases.

At a minimum, the proposed solution should support role-based access for the following user groups:

- Finance and Accounting Personnel
- Accounts Payable Personnel
- Procurement and Purchasing Personnel

- Budget and Financial Reporting Personnel
- Departmental Requestors
- Approvers and Supervisors
- Executive Management
- Internal and External Auditors
- System Administrators
- IT and Security Administrators

The solution must support configurable permissions based on job responsibilities, including inquiry-only access, transaction entry, approval authority, posting authority, reporting access, administrative functions, and segregation of duties controls.

Offerors must describe in their proposal the security model available within the proposed solution, including role-based access controls, approval authority controls, audit trail functionality, segregation of duties monitoring, and administrative security management capabilities.

201. Question: Are there specific segregation-of-duties rules the Authority wants enforced or reported?

Response: Yes. The Authority expects the system to support segregation-of-duties controls and reporting. Specific rules will be finalized during implementation, but vendors should describe how the system can enforce or report on conflicting access, approval authority, user roles, permissions, audit trails, and exceptions.

202. Question: Does the Authority require GASB-specific reporting formats or audit schedules from the system?

Response: Yes. The Authority requires the ability to support GASB-compliant financial reporting and annual financial statement audit requirements.

The proposed solution should provide robust financial reporting capabilities that support the preparation of financial statements, note disclosures, management reporting, audit schedules, reconciliations, and supporting documentation. The system should facilitate the extraction, reporting, and analysis of financial data necessary to comply with applicable GASB standards and support the annual external audit process.

The Authority does not expect the system to produce all financial statements, note disclosures, or audit schedules without review or supplemental analysis. However, the proposed solution should provide the underlying data, reporting capabilities, audit trails, and supporting schedules necessary to efficiently prepare and support GASB-compliant financial reporting.

Offerors must describe in their proposal the financial reporting tools, standard reports, configurable reporting capabilities, and audit support functionality available within the proposed solution, including any required third-party reporting applications or licensing.

203. Question: Is Project/Grant Management required as native Business Central functionality, through configuration, or via a third-party solution?

Response: Project/Grant Management is a required functional area for the Business Central implementation. The Authority does not currently use this functionality in Dynamics GP; however, the Authority would like to use Project/Grant Management functionality in Business Central. The Authority does not require that this functionality be delivered only through native Business Central functionality. Offerors must identify how the requirement will be met, whether through native Business Central functionality, configuration, Microsoft ecosystem tools, approved customization, or a third-party solution. If a third-party solution or add-on is required to meet the Project/Grant Management requirements, the Offeror must clearly identify the product,

functionality, licensing, implementation cost, integration approach, data ownership, security controls, support model, maintenance, upgrade impact, assumptions, limitations, and ongoing costs.

204. Question: Could you clarify how detailed the Project and Grant Management requirements are, and whether you expect this to be delivered through standard functionality or with additional solutions?

Response: The Authority does not currently use Project/Grant Management functionality in Dynamics GP; however, the Authority would like to use Project/Grant Management functionality in Business Central. The detailed Project and Grant Management requirements will be finalized during discovery and requirements validation. At a minimum, the Authority expects the solution to support tracking, reporting, budgeting, expenses, financial activity, and audit visibility by project, grant, department, location, funding source, or other approved dimensions. The Authority prefers standard Business Central functionality and configuration where feasible. Offerors must describe whether the requirements can be met through native Business Central functionality, configuration, Microsoft ecosystem tools, approved customization, or whether additional third-party solutions are recommended or required. Any additional solution must be clearly identified with related functionality, licensing, implementation cost, integration approach, security, data ownership, support model, assumptions, limitations, and ongoing costs.

205. Question: Are grants, projects, or programs tied to the account structure?

Response: The Authority does not currently utilize grants as a primary component of its structure; however, the proposed solution should support grant accounting and reporting capabilities should future business requirements necessitate their use.

206. Question: Will the Authority's Business Central licensing be procured and managed through the selected Contractor as CSP for the duration of the contract term, or does the Authority intend to assume licensing ownership through an alternate process or mechanism?

Response: All required licensing must be included in the Offeror's proposal for the full contract term. Licensing must be provided and managed through the Offeror as a Microsoft Cloud Solution Provider (CSP).

Offerors must clearly describe their proposed licensing approach, including all assumptions associated with the licensing model (e.g., user counts, modules, service levels), and provide all associated costs, including any estimated or variable costs, for the duration of the contract term.

207. Question: Should the licensing relationship be managed directly by the Authority, or through the implementation partner as part of the engagement?

Response: See response to Question 206.

208. Question: Does the Authority currently hold an active Business Ready Enhancement Plan (BREP) agreement for Dynamics GP, and if so, what is the current BREP amount and when is it due for renewal?

Response: The Authority's enhancement plan is yearly and will renew September 2026.

209. Question: Can the Authority confirm whether it currently has an active Microsoft Partner of Record for Dynamics GP, and if so, whether that relationship will affect the CSP assignment process for the selected Business Central Contractor?

Response: The Authority currently has an existing Microsoft Dynamics GP Value Added Reseller (VAR) relationship. Any existing GP VAR relationship will not affect the evaluation process, create preference for any Offeror, or replace the selected Business Central Contractor's responsibility to serve as the Microsoft-authorized CSP. The selected Prime Contractor must be responsible for the Business Central CSP assignment, licensing, implementation, support, and any required Microsoft partner or tenant coordination.

210. Question: Has the Authority procured any new Microsoft Dynamics GP licenses after September 1, 2022? If so, please confirm the number and type of licenses acquired, as this may have implications for the licensing transition and CSP agreement structure under the proposed Business Central implementation.

Response: No.

211. Question: On Licensing: The RFP specifies 35 Full User and 150 Team Member licenses — has the Authority conducted a formal license needs assessment, or is this an estimate that may be subject to change during the requirements phase?

Response: The identified licensing quantities of 35 Full Users and 150 Team Member licenses are correct. The Authority conducted an internal assessment of its operational and functional needs prior to the release of this RFP, and the identified license counts reflect those requirements.

212. Question: Are the 35 full users and 150 team/web users final, or should we assume these counts may change during negotiations?

Response: The identified licensing quantities of 35 Full Users and 150 Team Member licenses reflect the Authority's current assessed requirements. However, Offerors should recognize that final licensing quantities may vary based on the proposed solution, functionality, and licensing model.

213. Question: How many total users will require access to Business Central?

Response: See response to Question 212.

214. Question: Should we price Business Central Essentials, Premium, and mixed-license models as separate alternatives, or provide only the recommended model?

Response: Offerors must provide the recommended licensing model for the Authority and must clearly explain the rationale for the recommendation.

The proposal must identify whether the Offeror recommends Business Central Essentials, Business Central Premium, or a mixed-license model based on the Authority's functional, operational, reporting, and user access requirements.

Offerors must also provide clear pricing for each license type included in the recommended model, including full users, team member/web users, any additional required licenses, recurring costs, implementation-related licensing assumptions, and scalability considerations.

If an Offeror believes an alternate licensing model would provide a material benefit or cost difference, the alternate model may be presented separately for the Authority's consideration. The recommended model must remain clearly identified as the primary proposal.

215. Question: Will the Authority consider a mixed Essentials/Premium license model, or is there a preference for consistency across the user base?

Response: See response to Question 214.

216. Question: Can Offerors propose a phased license structure (mix of Essentials and Premium) vs. standard model?

Response: See response to Question 214.

217. Question: Do you have any preference between Essentials and Premium licensing, or would you expect us to recommend the optimal mix based on requirements?

Response: See response to Question 214.

218. Question: Can you share how the user base is structured, especially for the 35 full users across different departments and roles?

Response: The identified Full User licenses reflect the Authority's internal assessment of system users who require full transactional and functional access across relevant business units, including procurement, finance, and administrative roles. Offerors should base their proposed solution and licensing approach on the quantities provided.

219. Question: Are there any users who will require device licenses, external user access, or limited self-service/vendor access beyond the stated counts?

Response: The Authority has not identified any required device licenses, external user access, or limited self-service/vendor access beyond the stated license counts at this time. The RFP anticipates approximately 35 full user licenses and 150 web/team member user licenses. Offerors must review the Authority's functional requirements and recommend any additional licenses, device licenses, external access, vendor portal access, self-service access, or limited-use licenses needed to support the proposed solution. Any recommended licenses or access beyond the stated counts must be clearly identified, justified, and priced separately, including assumptions, limitations, security controls, and ongoing costs.

220. Question: Are any users external vendors, contractors, auditors, or other third parties?

Response: See response to Question 219.

221. Question: Should licensing for Power BI, Power Automate, OCR, AI, or third-party add-ons be included in the base proposal or listed separately as add alternates?

Response: Licensing required to meet the mandatory base scope must be included in the base proposal. This includes any required licensing for Business Central, Microsoft ecosystem tools, Power BI, Power Automate, OCR, AI, reporting tools, integrations, or third-party add-ons needed to satisfy mandatory RFP requirements.

Offerors must clearly identify all licensing included in the base proposal, including license type, quantity, user assumptions, recurring costs, implementation costs, support costs, and any limitations.

Any optional functionality, enhanced features, or future phase items that are not required to meet the mandatory base scope must be listed separately as add alternates. Add alternates must include separate pricing for licensing, implementation, integration, support, maintenance, security, data ownership, and ongoing costs.

If an Offeror believes a third-party add-on is required to meet a mandatory requirement, it must not be treated as optional unless the Offeror provides another fully compliant approach within the base proposal.

222. Question: Please confirm whether seasonal, temporary, auditor, external consultant, or occasional users will require system access during close, audit, reporting, or procurement review periods.

Response: Yes. The Authority anticipates that certain non-routine users may require system access from time to time to support financial reporting, audit activities, procurement reviews, system administration, implementation activities, and other business requirements.

Such users may include, but are not limited to:

- Internal and external auditors
- External consultants and implementation partners
- Temporary personnel
- Project-based resources
- Management and executive reviewers
- Other authorized users requiring inquiry, reporting, or limited transactional access

The proposed solution should support configurable role-based security, temporary access assignments, inquiry-only access, approval workflows, and audit trail functionality. The Authority expects access rights to be granted in accordance with business need and established security controls.

223. Question: On Procurement Module and E-Procurement: The e-procurement/electronic sourcing module is described as an "add alternate" — does the Authority have a preferred existing e-sourcing platform (e.g., DemandStar, Bonfire, OpenGov) or is a fully integrated BC-native or add-on solution preferred?

Response: The Authority does not currently utilize an existing e-procurement or electronic sourcing platform. Offerors are required to propose a solution that meets the requirements set forth in Section 6, Integrated E-Procurement and Electronic Sourcing.

Offerors should clearly describe their proposed approach, including whether the solution is native to Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central or provided through an add-on module or third-party platform, and how the proposed solution satisfies the requirements identified in the RFP.

Any proposed add-on module or third-party solution must be submitted as the required *add alternate* with separate pricing and must include all associated licensing, implementation, integration, and ongoing support costs for the full duration of the contract term.

224. Question: Are the procurement, contract management, vendor portal and e-sourcing capabilities expected in base Business Central scope, or can they be delivered through add-ons or Power Platform extensions?

Response: See response to Question 223.

225. Question: Are there any third-party tools or add-ons that you are already considering, particularly for procurement or specialized operations?

Response: See response to Question 223.

226. Question: Please identify which procurement, contract management, vendor portal and e-sourcing capabilities are mandatory for base scope and which may be proposed as add alternates.

Response: Procurement, contract management, vendor portal, and e-sourcing capabilities that are natively available within Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central and meet the requirements set forth in the RFP shall be included in the base scope.

To the extent that any required functionality is not natively available within Business Central, Offerors may propose add-on modules or third-party solutions. All such solutions must be submitted as *add alternates* and must include all associated licensing, implementation, integration, and ongoing support costs for the full duration of the contract term.

227. Question: Should add alternates be priced separately in a formal pricing schedule?

Response: With regard to Integrated E-Procurement and Electronic Sourcing, yes.

228. Question: Should optional e-procurement and electronic sourcing be priced as a separate add alternate only?

Response: Yes.

229. Question: For electronic sourcing / e-procurement, should we assume this is optional only, since the document refers to it as an add alternate?

Response: All responses must include an Integrated E-Procurement and Electronic Sourcing solution priced as an *add alternate*.

230. Question: Please confirm that integrated e-procurement/electronic sourcing should be priced separately as an add alternate, including RFIs, RFQs, IFBs, RFPs, vendor invitations, sealed bid submission, bid evaluation, award workflows, and conversion to contracts/POs?

Response: Confirmed.

231. Question: Is contract management expected to be included in the base solution or treated as an add alternate if third-party functionality is required?

Response: See response to Question 226.

232. Question: Should Offerors identify every requirement as out-of-the-box, configured, customized, integrated, add-on, or add alternate?

Response: Offerors must identify how each requirement will be met, including whether it is out-of-the-box, configured, customized, integrated, provided through a third-party add-on, or proposed as an alternate. Offerors should also identify any assumptions, limitations, additional costs, or dependencies related to each response.

233. Question: Please confirm whether PPA expects bidders to prioritize standard Business Central configuration wherever possible and identify custom extensions/add-ons separately from base scope.

Response: Yes. The Authority expects Offerors to prioritize the use of standard Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central functionality and configuration wherever practicable.

Offerors shall clearly identify any proposed customizations, extensions, ISV solutions, third-party applications, integrations, or other non-standard functionality required to meet the Authority's business requirements. Such items shall be separately identified and described within the proposal, including the business justification, functional benefits, licensing requirements, implementation effort, ongoing support considerations, and any impact on future upgrades or system maintenance.

The Authority prefers solutions that maximize the use of standard Business Central functionality while minimizing custom development and long-term support complexity. Offerors are encouraged to provide recommendations for business process improvements and configuration alternatives that reduce the need for customizations while meeting operational, reporting, security, and compliance requirements.

234. Question: For vendor onboarding and vendor self-service, is a portal mandatory in the base scope, or may this be proposed as an add alternate?

Response: Vendor onboarding and vendor self-service functionality must be included in the base scope.

Offerors must provide a secure vendor portal or vendor self-service interface that supports vendor onboarding, submission of required vendor information, document upload, approval workflow, audit trail, vendor master governance, and renewal or expiration tracking where applicable.

If the proposed vendor self-service functionality requires a third-party add-on, the Offeror must clearly identify the product, licensing, implementation cost, integration approach, support model, security controls, data ownership, maintenance, and any ongoing costs. The Offeror must also identify whether any enhanced or optional vendor portal functionality is proposed as an add alternate.

The Authority reserves the right to determine during evaluation and contract negotiations whether any proposed add alternate or enhanced vendor portal functionality will be included in the final scope.

235. Question: Are all listed procurement capabilities mandatory in the initial implementation, or may we phase some items post-go-live?

Response: It is preferred that all procurement capabilities are included in the initial implementation.

236. Question: How should we treat items that may require third-party solutions but are described as mandatory functional requirements?

Response: Mandatory functional requirements must be addressed by Offerors, even if the requirement cannot be met through native Business Central functionality alone. For each mandatory requirement, Offerors must clearly identify whether the functionality will be delivered through native Business Central SaaS, configuration, customization, Microsoft ecosystem tools, integration, or a third-party solution. If a third-party solution is required to meet a mandatory requirement, the Offeror must identify the third-party product, explain why it is required, describe how it integrates with Business Central, and disclose all related licensing, implementation, support, security, data ownership, maintenance, upgrade, and ongoing cost considerations.

Third-party solutions that are necessary to meet mandatory requirements must not be presented as optional unless the Offeror also provides an alternate approach that fully satisfies the requirement. Any optional enhancements or additional functionality beyond the mandatory scope may be proposed separately as add alternates.

237. Question: The document references both “Business Central SaaS” and broad requirements that may depend on third-party tools. Should proposals distinguish between Native Business Central functionality, Microsoft ecosystem extensions and Third-party add alternates?

Response: Yes. Offerors must clearly distinguish between functionality provided through native Business Central SaaS, Microsoft ecosystem extensions, and third-party add alternates.

For each requirement, Offerors must identify whether the functionality is provided through native Business Central, configuration, customization, Microsoft tools or extensions such as Power Platform, Power BI, Azure Logic Apps, Azure Functions, or through a third-party add-on.

Any third-party add-on or add alternate must be clearly identified separately, including related licensing, implementation, integration, support, security, data ownership, maintenance, upgrade impact, and ongoing cost considerations.

The Authority expects proposals to clearly identify all assumptions, limitations, dependencies, and any functionality that is not included in the base Business Central implementation.

238. Question: Does the Authority require fixed-price milestone pricing for the full implementation, or will time-and-materials components be accepted for uncertain areas such as integrations and custom reports?

Response: The Authority requires fixed-price milestone pricing for the full implementation. Each milestone must be fully inclusive of all deliverables, labor, services, and costs necessary to complete that phase of the project, as outlined in Section II-5.

Where Offerors believe certain elements may involve uncertainty (e.g., integrations or additional custom reports), such items must be clearly identified, scoped to the extent possible, and incorporated into the milestone pricing structure. Any assumptions or exclusions must be explicitly stated in the proposal.

239. Question: Should licensing, implementation, support, add-ons, optional services and add alternates be priced separately?

Response: See response to Question 238.

240. Question: Should implementation be proposed as fixed fee, time and materials, or a hybrid with milestone payments?

Response: See response to Question 238.

241. Question: Are dashboard and KPI requirements expected to be included in the base implementation cost?

Response: Yes. Dashboard and KPI requirements identified in the RFP must be included in the base implementation cost.

Offerors must include the design, configuration, testing, deployment, and documentation of required dashboards and KPIs needed to support financial, procurement, operational, audit, and executive reporting requirements. This includes dashboards and KPIs provided through Business Central, Power BI, Microsoft ecosystem tools, or other proposed reporting tools.

Any dashboards, KPIs, analytics, or reporting features that are not included in the base implementation cost must be clearly identified separately, including related licensing, implementation, support, maintenance, and ongoing cost considerations.

242. Question: Is there an anticipated budget range for licensing, implementation, and ongoing support?

Response: The Authority does not disclose budget information for public solicitations and expects Offerors to propose pricing based on their independently developed solutions.

243. Question: Is there an approved budget range or funding expectation for implementation, licensing, support, training, and optional add alternates?

Response: See response to Question 242.

244. Question: Are travel and onsite expenses expected to be included in the fixed price or listed separately?

Response: Travel and onsite expenses must be included in the fixed-price proposal and should align with the proposed project schedule and training plan.

245. Question: Can the Authority confirm whether all travel and onsite costs must be included in fixed pricing or may be billed with pre-approval?

Response: See response to Question 244.

246. Question: Can payment be tied to objective milestone deliverables and deemed acceptance if the Authority does not respond within a defined review period?

Response: No. Payment will not be released until the associated milestone, and all required deliverables have been submitted to and formally accepted by the Authority.

247. Question: What are the formal acceptance criteria for each milestone?

Response: The Authority expects the selected Offeror to develop and maintain a detailed implementation plan that includes milestone deliverables, acceptance criteria, responsibilities, dependencies, and approval requirements.

At a minimum, the Authority anticipates formal acceptance and sign-off for the following implementation phases:

- **Project Planning and Initiation**
- **Requirements Gathering and Discovery**
- **Solution Design**
- **Configuration and Development**
- **Data Migration**
- **Integration Development and Testing**
- **User Acceptance Testing (UAT)**
- **Training and Knowledge Transfer**
- **Go-Live Readiness**

- Production Go-Live
- Hypercare Completion

Acceptance criteria will be established jointly by the Authority and the selected Offeror and are expected to include successful completion of agreed-upon deliverables, testing requirements, issue resolution, documentation requirements, user acceptance, and achievement of project objectives.

Offerors must describe in their proposal their standard implementation methodology, milestone structure, deliverables, acceptance processes, and recommended acceptance criteria for each project phase.

248. Question: Should vendors include Microsoft licensing price increases escalation assumptions for option years?

Response: Yes. Offerors must identify and clearly explain any assumptions related to Microsoft licensing price escalations for option years in their proposal.

249. Question: Are travel, onsite workshops and onsite training expected to be included in fixed milestone pricing?

Response: See response to Question 244.

250. Question: For version control for financial plans, budgets and key documents, is SharePoint/Teams acceptable, or is this expected within the ERP itself?

Response: The Authority is open to utilizing either native Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central functionality or integrated document management and collaboration platforms for version control of financial plans, budgets, forecasts, and supporting documentation.

The Authority currently utilizes Microsoft SharePoint and Microsoft Teams for document collaboration and document management activities. Solutions that leverage and integrate with existing Microsoft technologies are acceptable.

Offerors must describe in their proposal how version control, document retention, collaboration, approvals, audit trails, and document security are managed within the proposed solution, including any dependencies on Business Central, Microsoft 365 applications, third-party applications, or integrated document management platforms.

The Authority's primary objective is to maintain appropriate version control, security, auditability, and accessibility of financial and supporting documentation, regardless of where the functionality resides.

251. Question: The RFP requires cloud SaaS but also references a Development environment. Should offerors assume a true separate development environment is mandatory, or a sandbox/UAT strategy within Business Central SaaS?

Response: Offerors must assume that separate environments are required to support production operations, testing/UAT, and development/configuration activities. Because Business Central is a SaaS solution, Offerors may propose the recommended Business Central SaaS environment strategy, including the use of sandbox environments for development, testing, configuration, and UAT.

Offerors must clearly describe the proposed environment structure, including Production, Sandbox/UAT, Development or development-equivalent sandbox environments, refresh strategy, access controls, data protection, and any licensing or cost impacts.

252. Question: Please confirm whether Production, Sandbox/UAT, and Development environments are required from day one or can be provisioned by project phase.

Response: See response to Question 251.

253. Question: Could you confirm the expected environment setup, such as the number of instances required for development, testing, and production?

Response: The Authority expects the proposed solution to include, at a minimum, separate production and non-production environments sufficient to support implementation, configuration, testing, training, user acceptance testing, and ongoing support activities.

Offerors should propose the recommended environment structure for Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central, including development, testing, user acceptance testing, training, sandbox, and production environments, as applicable.

The proposal should identify the number and purpose of each recommended environment, any licensing or cost implications, refresh procedures, data security controls, access restrictions, and how environments will be used during implementation and post-go-live support.

At a minimum, no configuration changes, updates, integrations, or customizations should be deployed directly to production without appropriate testing and approval in a non-production environment.

254. Question: The RFP references WCAG 2.1 AA. Does this requirement apply only to Microsoft SaaS/native interfaces, or also to any third-party add-ons and portals?

Response: See section 1 of “CHANGES TO THE RFP DOCUMENT”.

255. Question: Is offshore or nearshore delivery permitted for configuration, development, data migration or support tasks?

Response: Offshore or nearshore delivery is permitted only if clearly disclosed in the proposal and approved by the Authority. Vendors must identify which tasks may be performed offshore or nearshore, including configuration, development, data migration, or support. Vendors must also describe the location of the resources, data security controls, access restrictions, confidentiality protections, supervision model, and how Authority data will be protected. The Prime Contractor remains fully responsible for all work performed by offshore, nearshore, subcontracted, or third-party resources.

256. Question: Please confirm the preferred delivery model: onshore, offshore, or hybrid. If onsite or hybrid delivery is preferred, please specify which activities are expected onsite in Philadelphia, including workshops, training, UAT, go-live, and hypercare.

Response: The Authority prefers a hybrid delivery model with required onsite presence in Philadelphia for key project activities. Offerors must assume onsite presence for project kickoff, discovery workshops, requirements validation, major design sessions, UAT support, in-person training, train-the-trainer sessions, cutover planning, go-live support, and initial hypercare support. Configuration, development, data migration, report development, documentation, and routine project activities may be performed remotely when approved by the Authority, provided project schedule, quality, security, communication, and delivery requirements are maintained. Offshore delivery is not preferred. Any proposed offshore or nearshore resources must be clearly disclosed, including roles, work locations, data access, security controls, supervision model, and support responsibilities. The Prime Contractor remains fully responsible for all work performed. Offerors must include all onsite, remote, travel, staffing, and delivery assumptions in the proposal.

257. Question: Will deployment be requirement on Gov Cloud on the Commercial cloud? As this will impact how BC will need to be deployed (cloud vs local/Azure VM's) because Microsoft does not currently have a GCC or GCC-H version of D365 BC.

Response: The Authority expects Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central to be deployed as a cloud-based SaaS solution in the Microsoft commercial cloud, using U.S.-based Azure data centers only. The Authority is not requiring deployment in Microsoft Government Cloud, GCC, or GCC High. Authority data must not be hosted, stored, processed, replicated, or backed up in offshore or non-U.S. data centers. Offerors must not assume a local, on-premise, or Azure VM-based deployment unless specifically proposed as an alternate and approved by the Authority. Offerors must clearly describe the proposed deployment model, hosting environment, data

residency, security controls, licensing impact, limitations, assumptions, and any differences between the proposed Business Central SaaS deployment and any government-cloud or locally hosted alternatives.

258. Question: What reporting hierarchies currently exist?

Response: The Authority maintains multiple financial and operational reporting hierarchies to support management reporting, budgeting, financial reporting, operational oversight, and audit requirements.

Reporting structures include, but are not limited to:

- Organizational and departmental hierarchies
- Divisional reporting hierarchies
- Financial statement reporting hierarchies
- Budget reporting structures
- Account roll-up and summary reporting structures
- Interfund reporting relationships
- Project, program, and other management reporting structures, as applicable

Detailed reporting hierarchies and reporting requirements will be reviewed with the selected Offeror during the discovery and implementation phases.

Offerors must describe in their proposal how the proposed solution supports configurable reporting hierarchies, account roll-ups, organizational structures, management reporting, financial statement presentation, and changes to reporting structures over time.

259. Question: How many custom reports currently exist?

Response: The Authority has developed a variety of custom financial, operational, budgetary, management, audit, and regulatory reports over time. The Authority has not completed a comprehensive inventory of all custom reports and therefore cannot provide an exact count at this time.

Offerors should assume that a combination of standard and custom reports are currently utilized to support financial reporting, budget reporting, operational reporting, management reporting, audit support, and regulatory requirements.

The selected Offeror will be expected to conduct discovery activities to identify critical reporting requirements and provide recommendations regarding the migration, replacement, enhancement, or consolidation of existing reports within the Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central environment.

260. Question: What reporting tools are currently used?

- a. SQL Server Reporting Services (SSRS)
- b. Microsoft Excel
- c. Power BI
- d. SmartList
- e. Other (Specify)

Response: Finance regularly utilizes SQL Server Reporting Services (SSRS), Microsoft Excel, and SmartList for financial reporting, management reporting, operational reporting, and ad hoc data analysis.

In addition, the Authority utilizes standard Microsoft Dynamics GP reporting capabilities and other reporting tools as necessary to support financial, budgetary, operational, audit, and regulatory reporting requirements.

Offerors must describe in their proposal the reporting tools, dashboards, ad hoc query capabilities, data export functionality, and business intelligence features available within the proposed solution, including any required third-party applications or licensing.

Procurement uses Smartlist and Excel.

261. Question: What level of report complexity should be assumed for the 15 included custom reports?

Response: The Authority anticipates that the fifteen (15) included custom reports will represent a mix of moderate and advanced reporting requirements.

Reports may include financial, budgetary, operational, management, audit, regulatory, and reconciliation reporting and may require features such as:

- **Multiple filtering and parameter options**
- **Data from multiple modules and reporting dimensions**
- **Departmental, divisional, and organizational roll-ups**
- **Budget-to-actual comparisons**
- **Interfund reporting**
- **Export capabilities to Microsoft Excel and PDF**
- **Drill-down and inquiry functionality, where available**
- **User-defined sorting, grouping, and summarization**

Offerors should assume that some reports may require data from multiple tables, modules, or business processes. The specific reports to be developed will be identified during discovery and requirements gathering.

Offerors should describe any assumptions regarding report complexity, limitations on report development, and any criteria used to distinguish standard reports from custom reports.

262. Question: Can the Authority provide categories for the 15 reports, such as finance, AR, AP, procurement, grant, executive dashboard or audit reports?

Response: The Authority anticipates that the fifteen (15) included custom reports will primarily fall within the following categories:

- **General Ledger and Financial Reporting**
- **Budgeting and Budget-to-Actual Reporting**
- **Accounts Payable Reporting**
- **Accounts Receivable Reporting**
- **Procurement and Purchasing Reporting**
- **Cash Management and Banking Reporting**
- **Fixed Asset Reporting**
- **Interfund and Internal Allocation Reporting**
- **Management and Executive Reporting**
- **Audit and Compliance Reporting**
- **Operational and Departmental Reporting**

The Authority has not finalized the specific reports to be developed and expects the selected Offeror to work with Authority personnel during the discovery phase to identify, prioritize, and define the detailed reporting requirements.

Offerors should assume that custom reports may include financial, operational, management, audit, regulatory, reconciliation, and exception reporting requirements and should describe any assumptions regarding report development, complexity, and limitations.

263. Question: The RFP requires 15 customized reports plus a minimum of 6 AR-specific custom reports. Are these six included within the 15 total, or in addition to the 15?

Response: The six Accounts Receivable-specific custom reports are in addition to the fifteen customized reports required in the RFP.

Offerors must include the design, development, testing, deployment, documentation, and knowledge transfer for fifteen customized reports in the base implementation cost. Offerors must also include, separately, the minimum six Accounts Receivable custom reports tailored to the Authority's operational needs.

Therefore, Offerors must assume a minimum of twenty-one customized reports total: fifteen general customized reports plus six Accounts Receivable-specific custom reports.

However, if the Authority determines during contract negotiations that fewer than fifteen general customized reports are required, the Authority may include some or all of the six Accounts Receivable-specific custom reports within the initial reporting scope and base implementation cost. Final report count, prioritization, and pricing treatment will be determined during contract negotiations.

Offerors must provide separate pricing for any customized reports beyond the final required reporting scope, including hourly rates, estimated level of effort, licensing, software, or development costs.

264. Question: The RFP references 15 custom reports and at least six custom Accounts Receivable reports. Please confirm whether the six AR reports are included within the 15 custom reports or are additional.

Response: See response to Question 263.

265. Question: Will the Authority provide a prioritized list of required reports before proposal submission?

Response: The Authority will not provide a final prioritized list of all required reports before proposal submission.

Offerors must base their proposals on the reporting requirements identified in the RFP, including standard reporting, ad hoc reporting, dashboards/KPIs, Power BI or equivalent reporting, audit reporting, procurement reporting, financial reporting, and the required custom reports.

The Authority has identified examples of required Accounts Receivable reports and expects Offerors to include the required reporting scope in the base implementation cost where stated in the RFP. Final report prioritization, detailed specifications, layouts, fields, filters, and delivery schedule will be confirmed during requirements validation and implementation planning.

Offerors must describe their reporting approach, assumptions, included reports, report development process, user modification capabilities, and pricing for any additional reports beyond the required scope.

266. Question: The RFP references a minimum of 6 custom AR reports in Section IV-B-3 but does not identify the remaining reports. Can the Authority provide a list or names of the 15 required custom reports? Additionally, are these reports expected to be Power BI-based or Business Central native static reports, or a combination of both?

Response: The Authority will not provide a final list of all fifteen required custom reports before proposal submission. Offerors must base their proposal on the reporting requirements identified in the RFP and must

include the design, development, testing, deployment, documentation, and knowledge transfer for fifteen customized reports in the base implementation cost.

The minimum six Accounts Receivable custom reports are in addition to the fifteen customized reports unless otherwise determined during contract negotiations. If the Authority determines during contract negotiations that fewer than fifteen general customized reports are required, the Authority may include some or all of the six Accounts Receivable specific reports within the initial reporting scope and base implementation cost. Final report count, prioritization, report names, layouts, fields, filters, and delivery schedule will be confirmed during requirements validation and implementation planning.

Examples of report areas may include financial reporting, budget vs. actual reporting, procurement reporting, vendor reporting, payment reporting, bank reconciliation reporting, fixed asset reporting, contract reporting, audit support reports, executive dashboards, and operational financial reports.

Reports may be delivered through a combination of Business Central native reports, Power BI dashboards, paginated reports, Excel-based reporting, or other Microsoft-supported reporting tools. Offerors must recommend the appropriate reporting tool for each report type and must clearly identify whether each report is Business Central native, Power BI-based, configured, customized, or dependent on a third-party tool.

All required reports must be documented and transferable to the Authority for future modification and maintenance without ongoing vendor dependency.

267. Question: Will we receive any additional information on what the Authority's reporting requirements are so that we can better scope the effort for creating them?

Response: See response to Question 266.

268. Question: Could you share examples or a list of the reports you would expect as part of the 15 required reports mentioned in the RFP?

Response: See response to Question 266.

269. Question: Will the Authority provide sample reports, sample workflows, chart of accounts structure and process documentation during proposal or only after award?

Response: The Authority does not currently anticipate providing detailed sample reports, complete workflow documentation, process maps, or the full Chart of Accounts structure as part of the proposal process.

The Authority may provide supplemental information through the formal question-and-answer process if it determines that such information is necessary to clarify requirements or support proposal preparation.

Detailed reporting requirements, workflow requirements, Chart of Accounts information, process documentation, and other implementation-related materials will be made available to the selected Offeror during the discovery and implementation phases.

Offerors must base their proposals on the requirements and information provided in the RFP and are encouraged to describe any assumptions made regarding reporting, workflows, Chart of Accounts structure, integrations, and business processes.

270. Question: Please confirm the expected workflow automation scope across Finance, AP, AR, Procurement, Vendor Management, Budget Approval, Grant/Project approvals, and reporting approvals. Please include key approval thresholds, routing rules, delegation, escalation, and exception handling.

Response: The Authority expects the proposed solution to provide configurable workflow automation capabilities across applicable business processes, including but not limited to:

- Finance and Accounting

- **Accounts Payable**
- **Accounts Receivable**
- **Procurement and Purchasing**
- **Vendor Management**
- **Budget Development and Budget Approvals**
- **Project and Program Approvals, as applicable**
- **Financial Reporting and Review Processes**

The Authority currently utilizes workflow automation for various procurement and accounts payable activities and anticipates expanding workflow capabilities where appropriate within the Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central environment.

The proposed solution should support:

- **Multi-level approval workflows**
- **Configurable approval hierarchies**
- **Approval routing based on business rules and user roles**
- **Dollar threshold-based approvals**
- **Departmental and divisional approval routing**
- **Delegation of authority**
- **Temporary approver assignments**
- **Automated notifications and reminders**
- **Escalation procedures for overdue approvals**
- **Exception handling and override processes with appropriate audit trails**
- **Workflow monitoring and reporting**
- **Complete audit trail and approval history**

Specific approval thresholds, routing rules, delegation requirements, escalation procedures, and exception handling requirements will be reviewed and finalized during the discovery and implementation phases.

Offerors must describe in their proposal the workflow automation capabilities available within the proposed solution and identify any limitations, required customizations, third-party applications, or additional licensing necessary to meet the Authority's workflow requirements.

271. Question: Regarding Section IV-B.3, please provide examples or descriptions of the six required custom Accounts Receivable reports.

Response:

- **AR Reconciliation Report by Operational Identifier** this report shows invoices, payments, adjustments, and balances by identifiers such as license plate number, customer code, RFID/AVI/EGO tag number, proxy card number, permit/access credential number, invoice number, transaction batch, location, and amount.
- **Open Invoice Detail Report** listing outstanding invoices by customer, invoice number, invoice date, due date, aging category, location, revenue type, operational identifier, and balance due.

- **Payment and Cash Receipt Report** showing payments received through the banking platform and/or AR solution, including payment date, amount, payment method, customer code, invoice number, batch number, location, and reconciliation status.
- **Monthly Billing Summary Report** summarizing monthly billing activity by customer, location, revenue type, invoice count, total billed amount, payments received, adjustments, outstanding balance, and operational identifiers where applicable.
- **Customer Account Activity Report** showing customer-level billing, invoice, payment, adjustment, and balance activity by customer code and related operational identifiers.
- **Customer and Identifier Report by Location** showing all customers assigned to or associated with each location, including customer code, customer name, license plate number, RFID/AVI/EGO tag number, proxy card number, permit/access credential number, invoice number, billing status, active/inactive status, and other related operational identifiers.

Final report specifications will be confirmed during implementation. Offerors must describe how the proposed Business Central compatible solution, including any add-ons, integrations, data imports, or reporting tools, will support these reports and allow authorized users to generate, modify, export, and maintain AR reports without ongoing vendor dependency.

Offerors should include the design, development, testing, and deployment of the required custom AR reports in their proposal.

272. Question: Regarding Section IV-B.3, can the Authority provide examples of the six required custom AR reports?

Response: See response to Question 271.

273. Question: Regarding Section IV-B.3, do AR reports need to support drill-through to operational systems?

Response: Where feasible, AR reports should support drill-through or reference-level detail to related operational and payment data. At a minimum, AR reports must support searchable and reportable operational identifiers, including license plate numbers, customer codes, RFIF tag numbers, proxy card numbers, invoice numbers, transaction batches, locations, and amounts. Offerors should describe available drill-through capabilities, integration options, reporting limitations, and any Business Central add-ons or tools required to replace the current AR reconciliation program.

274. Question: Please confirm whether the 15 custom reports are expected to be Business Central reports, Power BI reports, paginated reports, Excel layouts or a combination.

Response: The Authority has not prescribed a specific reporting technology for the fifteen (15) included custom reports.

Offerors may propose Business Central native reports, Power BI reports, paginated reports, Excel-based reports and layouts, or a combination thereof, as appropriate to meet the Authority's business requirements.

The Authority's primary objective is to obtain reporting solutions that provide accurate, maintainable, secure, and user-friendly reporting capabilities for financial, operational, management, audit, regulatory, and budgetary purposes.

Offerors should identify the proposed reporting technology for each report type, including any licensing requirements, dependencies, limitations, maintenance considerations, and user access requirements. The selected reporting approach should support data analysis, export capabilities, auditability, and long-term supportability.

Specific report requirements and the most appropriate reporting method will be finalized during the discovery and implementation phases.

275. Question: Should Power BI reports use Business Central APIs, Data Lake/Fabric, Azure SQL, OData or another data layer?

Response: The Authority has not prescribed a specific data layer for Power BI reporting.

Offerors should recommend the most appropriate reporting architecture for the proposed Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central environment, which may include Business Central APIs, OData, Azure SQL, Microsoft Fabric/Data Lake, or other supported data access methods.

The proposed approach should consider report performance, refresh frequency, security, data governance, scalability, auditability, licensing requirements, cost, long-term supportability, and ease of use for Authority staff.

Offerors should describe the recommended data architecture for Power BI and other reporting solutions, including any dependencies, limitations, data refresh schedules, security model, and required Microsoft or third-party licensing.

276. Question: Do you see reporting being primarily handled within Business Central, or would there be a strong reliance on Power BI for analytics and dashboards?

Response: See response to Question 275.

277. Question: What reporting tools are preferred for custom reporting, Native Business Central reports, Excel layouts, Power BI or SSRS/other tools?

Response: The Authority does not require a specific reporting tool for all custom reporting requirements and is open to a combination of reporting technologies based on the intended use case.

The Authority generally prefers solutions that leverage standard Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central functionality and the Microsoft reporting ecosystem, including native Business Central reports, Excel-based reporting, and Power BI, where appropriate.

Offerors should recommend the most appropriate reporting tool for each reporting requirement based on functionality, usability, maintainability, performance, security, licensing requirements, and long-term supportability.

The Authority prefers to minimize custom development and reliance on unsupported or highly customized reporting solutions. Offerors should clearly identify any proposed third-party reporting tools, custom report development requirements, or additional licensing needed to support the proposed reporting solution.

278. Question: What are the mandatory executive dashboards for go-live?

Response: The Authority has not finalized the specific executive dashboards required for go-live and expects the selected Offeror to assist in defining dashboard requirements during the discovery and design phases.

At a minimum, the Authority anticipates executive and management reporting requirements in the following areas:

- Financial performance and key financial metrics
- Budget-to-actual reporting
- Revenue and expenditure trends
- Cash balances and cash flow reporting
- Accounts payable and accounts receivable metrics
- Procurement and purchasing activity

- Operational performance indicators
- Division and departmental performance reporting
- Audit, compliance, and exception reporting

The Authority expects dashboards to provide role-based access, drill-down capabilities, configurable filters, and timely access to key performance indicators and management information.

Offerors should describe the dashboard and business intelligence capabilities available within the proposed solution, including standard dashboards, customization options, data refresh capabilities, and any required licensing.

279. Question: Do reports require row-level security by department, fund, project, grant or role?

Response: Yes. The Authority expects the proposed reporting solution to support role-based security and data access controls, including row-level security where appropriate.

Reporting access may need to be restricted based on organizational structure, business function, security role, department, division, project, program, or other reporting dimensions as determined during the discovery and implementation phases.

The proposed solution should support:

- Role-based report access
- Row-level security and data filtering
- Departmental and divisional data restrictions
- Executive and management-level reporting access
- Auditor and inquiry-only access
- Segregation of duties requirements
- Centralized security administration and audit trails

The Authority has not finalized all reporting security requirements and expects the selected Offeror to work with Authority personnel to define and configure appropriate reporting security models during implementation.

Offerors should describe the row-level security, report security, and data governance capabilities available within the proposed solution, including any limitations, dependencies, or licensing requirements.

280. Question: Will users need to create ad hoc reports without vendor assistance, and which tool should be used for self-service?

Response: Yes. The Authority expects authorized users to be able to create, modify, and maintain ad hoc reports, queries, and data analyses without requiring ongoing vendor assistance.

The Authority prefers self-service reporting capabilities that can be utilized by Finance and other authorized business users with minimal technical expertise. The proposed solution should support user-configurable reporting, filtering, sorting, grouping, exporting, and data analysis capabilities.

The Authority has not prescribed a specific self-service reporting tool and is open to solutions utilizing Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central reporting capabilities, Power BI, Excel-based reporting, or other Microsoft-supported tools. Offerors should recommend the most appropriate self-service reporting approach and describe the level of user training, technical expertise, and administrative support required.

Offerors must also identify any limitations, licensing requirements, dependencies, or functionality that would require vendor involvement or custom development.

281. Question: What export formats are required: Excel, PDF, CSV, paginated reports or scheduled email subscriptions?

Response: The Authority expects the proposed solution to support multiple report export and distribution formats to accommodate operational, management, audit, regulatory, and financial reporting requirements.

At a minimum, the solution should support:

- Microsoft Excel (.xlsx)
- PDF
- CSV
- Screen-based inquiry and report viewing
- Scheduled report distribution and email subscriptions

The Authority is also interested in understanding the availability of additional reporting and distribution capabilities, including paginated reports, dashboard subscriptions, automated report scheduling, report bursting, and secure report sharing.

Offerors should describe the export, scheduling, distribution, and subscription capabilities available within the proposed solution, including any licensing requirements, limitations, or dependencies associated with these features.

282. Question: What batch processes are most time-sensitive, such as bank reconciliation, payment runs, report refreshes or integrations?

Response: The Authority has several business-critical processes that are time-sensitive and support daily operations, cash management, financial reporting, month-end close, and audit requirements.

Examples of time-sensitive processes include:

- Payroll imports and related journal entry processing
- Accounts payable payment processing, including check, ACH, and wire payment activities
- Bank statement imports and bank reconciliation processes
- Positive Pay and banking file generation and transmission
- Financial reporting and management reporting refreshes
- Budget-to-actual reporting and forecasting updates
- Data imports and integrations with payroll, banking, and other third-party systems
- Month-end, quarter-end, and year-end close activities
- Audit-related reporting and reconciliation processes

The Authority expects critical batch processes to be reliable, auditable, and capable of supporting established operational and financial reporting deadlines. Offerors should describe any processing limitations, scheduling capabilities, monitoring tools, error handling procedures, notification capabilities, and recommended approaches for managing business-critical batch processing activities.

283. Question: What OCR platform, if any, is currently used or preferred?

Response: The Authority does not currently have a preferred OCR platform for this implementation.

Offerors must recommend an OCR/AP automation solution that is compatible with Business Central and supports invoice capture, data extraction, validation, approval workflow, audit trail, reporting, and document attachment. Offerors must clearly identify whether the proposed OCR solution is native to Business Central, part of the Microsoft ecosystem, or a third-party add-on.

Any proposed OCR solution must include related licensing, implementation, integration, support, security, data ownership, maintenance, upgrade impact, and ongoing cost considerations.

284. Question: Does the Authority have a preferred OCR/AP automation tool, or should Offerors recommend one?

Response: See response to Question 283.

285. Question: Please confirm OCR and invoice automation expectations, including whether PPA has an existing OCR tool, expects bidders to recommend one, or prefers Business Central/Power Platform-based automation?

Response: See response to Question 283.

286. Question: Is OCR (Optical Character Recognition) currently utilized?

Response: See response to Question 283.

287. Question: Will UAT test scripts be written by the Contractor, Authority, or jointly?

Response: UAT test scripts are expected to be developed jointly by the Contractor and the Authority. The Contractor should provide the initial UAT test script templates, recommended scenarios, and testing approach based on the configured solution and business processes. The Authority will review, provide input, and validate that the scripts reflect actual business requirements, workflows, and expected outcomes.

288. Question: Will the Authority provide dedicated users for UAT and data validation?

Response: Yes. The Authority will provide designated subject matter experts and business users to participate in UAT and data validation. Vendors should describe the expected time commitment, roles, responsibilities, testing approach, data validation process, issue tracking, and support needed from Authority users.

289. Question: How many mock migrations does the Authority expect before final cutover?

Response: The Contractor must conduct multiple mock migrations and test cycles before final cutover. At a minimum, the Authority expects at least two full mock migration/test cycles before final production migration.

Each mock migration/test cycle must include data extraction, mapping, conversion, loading, validation, reconciliation, issue identification, issue resolution, and documented results. Additional mock migrations or test cycles may be required based on data volume, complexity, reconciliation results, unresolved discrepancies, system readiness, or Authority business need.

290. Question: How many mock migrations/test cycles are expected at minimum?

Response: See response to Question 289.

291. Question: Would you be open to a phased rollout approach, or are you expecting a single go-live across all modules?

Response: A single GO-LIVE would be preferred.

The Authority's objective is a successful implementation that minimizes operational disruption, controls project risk, and achieves the project's business objectives. The Authority has identified a target go-live date of April 1; however, the specific deployment strategy has not been prescribed.

Offerors may propose either a phased implementation approach, a single go-live approach, or a hybrid deployment strategy, provided they clearly explain the rationale, benefits, risks, dependencies, resource requirements, and impact on the proposed implementation schedule.

The Authority will evaluate proposed deployment approaches based on factors including:

- Project risk
- Business continuity
- User adoption and training considerations
- Data migration complexity
- Integration requirements
- Operational impact
- Resource requirements
- Overall implementation timeline

Offerors should clearly identify their recommended deployment strategy and explain how it will support a successful transition to Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central while meeting the Authority's operational, financial, reporting, and control requirements.

292. Question: Is a phased deployment approach acceptable?

Response: See response to Question 291.

293. Question: Is there a target go-live date or a preferred go-live window (for example after year-end, quarter-end, or audit completion)?

Response: The Authority's target go-live date for Business Central is April 1, 2028. Offerors must propose an implementation schedule that supports this target go-live date, including discovery, design, configuration, data migration, testing, training, parallel validation, cutover planning, go-live, and hypercare. The implementation plan must account for key financial activities, including month-end close, year-end close, audit support, data validation, reporting readiness, and user training. Any schedule assumptions, dependencies, risks, or recommended adjustments to the go-live timeline must be clearly identified in the proposal.

294. Question: What is the desired go-live date?

Response: See response to Question 293.

295. Question: Is fiscal year-end being considered as a target go-live period?

Response: See response to Question 293.

296. Question: Are there any blackout periods during which cutovers cannot occur?

Response: The Authority anticipates that certain business and financial reporting periods may be unsuitable for system cutover activities due to operational, financial reporting, audit, payroll, budget, and other business requirements.

While no specific blackout periods have been established at this time, Offerors should assume that cutover activities must be carefully coordinated to avoid disruption to critical business operations, including:

- Payroll processing periods
- Month-end close activities
- Quarter-end close activities

- Year-end financial reporting activities
- Annual audit activities
- Budget development and adoption activities
- Critical payment processing cycles

The selected Offeror will be expected to work with the Authority to develop a detailed cutover plan and implementation schedule that minimizes operational risk and business disruption.

Offerors should identify any assumptions regarding cutover timing, blackout periods, business continuity considerations, and go-live support requirements.

297. Question: Are there any blackout periods that must be avoided?

Response: See response to Question 296.

298. Question: What are the specific final acceptance criteria beyond successful testing and issue resolution?

Response: Final Acceptance will be based on the Authority's confirmation that the implemented solution is fully operational and meets the requirements of the RFP and approved project scope.

At a minimum, Final Acceptance criteria must include successful completion of required testing, resolution of all critical and high-priority issues, successful data migration validation and reconciliation, completion of required training and knowledge transfer, delivery and approval of required documentation, successful cutover/go-live, confirmation that required reports and integrations are functioning, and confirmation that the system supports required financial reporting, operational processes, audit requirements, and Authority business workflows.

The Contractor must provide written documentation confirming successful migration validation, reconciliation, testing completion, issue resolution, and delivery of required project deliverables prior to Final Acceptance.

299. Question: Can the Authority define severity levels for testing defects and production incidents?

Response: The Authority has not established formal project-specific defect and incident severity classifications for this implementation and expects the selected Offeror to propose a standard severity framework for review and approval.

At a minimum, the Authority anticipates the following general classifications:

Severity 1 (Critical)

- System unavailable or major business process unable to function
- No acceptable workaround available
- Significant impact to financial operations, payroll, payments, reporting, security, or regulatory compliance

Severity 2 (High)

- Significant impairment of business functionality
- Workaround available but operationally burdensome
- Material impact on users, reporting, or processing activities

Severity 3 (Medium)

- Partial loss of functionality or non-critical process impact
- Acceptable workaround available

- **Limited business impact**

Severity 4 (Low)

- **Cosmetic issues, minor defects, documentation issues, or enhancement requests**
- **No material impact on business operations**

Offerors should describe their proposed defect management, issue tracking, escalation procedures, severity definitions, response times, resolution targets, and production support processes for both implementation and post-go-live support.

300. Question: Who within the Authority will approve UAT completion, Migration validation, and Final acceptance?

Response: Approval of UAT completion, migration validation, and Final Acceptance will be provided by the appropriate Authority project governance representatives.

At a minimum, UAT completion must be approved by the applicable Authority module leads and subject matter experts responsible for the tested processes. Migration validation must be approved by the applicable data owners, Finance leadership, and subject matter experts responsible for validating migrated data, reconciliations, balances, transactions, reports, and supporting records. Final Acceptance must be approved by the Authority’s designated project leadership, with input from Finance, Procurement, IT, and other required stakeholders.

The final approval roles, sign-off process, documentation requirements, and acceptance workflow will be confirmed during project planning and governance setup.

301. Question: Is there a preferred split of responsibilities between your internal team and the implementation partner during support and operations?

Response: The Authority expects a collaborative partnership with the selected Offeror during implementation, go-live, and ongoing support activities. Specific responsibilities will be refined during project planning and implementation.

Generally, the Authority anticipates that:

The Implementation Partner will be responsible for:

- **Project management and implementation leadership**
- **Solution design and configuration**
- **Data migration planning and execution**
- **Integration design, development, and testing**
- **Customizations, extensions, and report development included within the project scope**
- **Knowledge transfer and training**
- **Go-live support and hypercare services**
- **Ongoing application support and maintenance, as contracted**

The Authority will be responsible for:

- **Project sponsorship and governance**
- **Business process participation and requirements validation**
- **Data review, cleansing, and validation**

- User acceptance testing participation
- Security role and user access decisions
- Approval of project deliverables and milestones
- End-user training participation
- Ongoing business process ownership

Following implementation, the Authority expects to perform routine system administration, reporting, user support, and day-to-day operational activities to the extent practical. The Authority also expects the selected Offeror to provide post-go-live support services, technical expertise, issue resolution, system updates, and advisory services as required.

Offerors should describe their recommended support model, including the division of responsibilities between the Authority and the implementation partner during implementation, hypercare, and ongoing support.

302. Question: Please define expected Authority resource availability for workshops, data cleansing, testing, UAT, training and acceptance sign-off.

Response: The Authority recognizes that successful implementation will require active participation by business, finance, technical, and project stakeholders. The Authority anticipates dedicating appropriate resources throughout the project lifecycle; however, specific staffing levels and time commitments will vary by project phase.

The Authority expects to provide resources for:

- Project governance and executive sponsorship
- Discovery and requirements workshops
- Business process reviews
- Data review, validation, and cleansing activities
- Configuration review sessions
- Integration and data migration testing
- User Acceptance Testing (UAT)
- Training participation and knowledge transfer activities
- Go-live readiness assessments
- Milestone review and acceptance sign-off

Offerors should assume that Authority personnel will continue to perform normal operational responsibilities during the implementation and should propose an implementation approach that efficiently utilizes Authority resources.

The selected Offeror will be expected to identify required Authority participation, estimated resource commitments by project phase, key decision points, and required deliverables as part of the project planning process.

Offerors should clearly identify any assumptions regarding Authority resource availability, staffing requirements, subject matter expert participation, testing responsibilities, training participation, and acceptance activities.

303. Question: What financial statements and budget-versus-actual reports are mandatory for go-live?

Response: At a minimum, the Authority expects the following financial reporting capabilities to be available at go-live:

Financial Statements

- Balance Sheet / Statement of Net Position
- Income Statement / Statement of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Net Position
- Statement of Cash Flows or supporting cash reporting
- Trial Balance
- General Ledger detail and account activity reports

Budget and Management Reporting

- Budget-to-Actual reports by department
- Budget-to-Actual reports by division
- Budget-to-Actual reports at the account level
- Variance reporting with current period and year-to-date activity
- Revenue and expenditure reporting
- Management reporting with summary and detail drill-down capabilities

Operational and Financial Reporting

- Accounts Payable aging reports
- Accounts Receivable aging reports
- Cash and bank activity reports
- Fixed asset reporting
- Interfund reporting and reconciliation support

The Authority expects these reports to support filtering, sorting, exporting, and reporting by applicable organizational dimensions. Additional reporting requirements will be identified and prioritized during the discovery and implementation phases.

Offerors must identify in their proposal any reports requiring customization, third-party tools, or additional licensing to meet these requirements.

304. Question: Who will sign off migration reconciliation reports?

Response: Migration reconciliation reports will be reviewed and signed off by the appropriate Authority business owners and subject matter experts, with Finance leadership providing final approval for financial data. The Contractor is responsible for preparing the reconciliation reports, identifying exceptions, supporting issue resolution, and providing evidence that migrated data balances to the approved source data.

305. Question: What decision turnaround time should be assumed for design approvals, configuration approvals and deliverable sign-offs?

Response: The Authority recognizes that timely decisions and approvals are critical to project success and expects to actively participate throughout the implementation.

Unless otherwise agreed, Offerors should assume the following target turnaround times:

- **Design reviews and design approvals: Five (5) business days**
- **Configuration reviews and approvals: Five (5) business days**
- **Deliverable reviews and sign-offs: Five (5) business days**
- **Requests for clarification and routine project decisions: Two (2) to three (3) business days**
- **Critical project issues requiring management review: As soon as practicable based on the urgency and business impact**

The selected Offeror will be expected to identify decision points, required Authority actions, dependencies, and review periods within the project schedule. The Authority and selected Offeror will work collaboratively to establish governance procedures and escalation paths to avoid project delays.

Offerors should identify any assumptions regarding review periods, approval timelines, and decision-making requirements that may affect the proposed implementation schedule.

306. Question: Does the Authority have existing change management standards, communication channels or stakeholder groups?

Response: The Authority has existing stakeholder groups and internal communication channels that will support project change management. Offerors should propose a change management approach that includes stakeholder engagement, communication planning, training support, readiness activities, and adoption support. The final change management plan, communication channels, and stakeholder groups will be confirmed during implementation planning with the Authority.

307. Question: Is parallel run expected for any processes after go-live?

Response: Yes. A parallel run is expected for key financial and operational processes where necessary to validate that Business Central reconciles to the Authority's current system and supports accurate daily and monthly processing.

At a minimum, Offerors must plan for parallel validation of critical processes such as General Ledger, Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable, bank reconciliation, cash receipts, reporting, data migration balances, and month-end close activities. Offerors must describe the proposed parallel run approach, duration, processes included, reconciliation procedures, Authority resource needs, issue resolution process, and acceptance criteria.

The final scope and duration of any parallel run will be confirmed during project planning and cutover planning.

308. Question: Please confirm whether PPA expects a parallel run of Microsoft Dynamics GP and Business Central before go-live. If yes, please confirm the expected duration and the processes, reports, reconciliations, and month-end activities to be validated in parallel.

Response: Offerors must propose the recommended duration of the parallel run based on the implementation approach, testing results, data migration results, reporting readiness, reconciliation requirements, and operational risk.

The Authority expects the parallel run to be long enough to validate critical daily and monthly financial processes, including month-end close activities where applicable. The final duration will be confirmed during project planning and cutover planning. Offerors must describe the proposed duration, processes included reconciliation procedures, Authority resource needs, issue resolution process, and acceptance criteria.

309. Question: Do you have any expectations regarding the duration of a parallel run with the existing GP system?

Response: Offerors must propose the recommended duration of the parallel run based on the implementation approach, testing results, data migration results, reporting readiness, reconciliation requirements, and operational risk.

The Authority expects the parallel run to be long enough to validate critical daily and monthly financial processes, including month-end close activities where applicable. The final duration will be confirmed during project planning and cutover planning. Offerors must describe the proposed duration, processes included reconciliation procedures, Authority resource needs, issue resolution process, and acceptance criteria.

310. Question: What defects are acceptable at go-live, if any?

Response: Critical or high-severity defects are not acceptable at go-live. The solution must be operational, tested, and able to support required financial processing, reporting, security, integrations, data migration validation, and user workflows before go-live approval. Only low-severity defects or minor cosmetic issues may be acceptable at go-live, subject to Authority review and approval, provided they do not impact financial accuracy, business operations, reporting, audit requirements, security, data integrity, user access, integrations, or required functionality. Any approved open defects must have a documented remediation plan, owner, priority, target resolution date, and agreed workaround where applicable.

311. Question: Are accessibility test results or WCAG evidence required before go-live?

Response: See section 1 of "CHANGES TO THE RFP DOCUMENT".

312. Question: How many users are expected to receive

- a. End-user training
- b. Finance/power-user training
- c. Administrator training
- d. Train-the-trainer training

Response: The Authority has not established fixed user counts by training type as this will be dependent on the solution presented. Offerors are required to propose a comprehensive training approach that addresses end users, finance/power users, system administrators, and train-the-trainer roles.

Responses should identify the recommended number of users for each training category, along with associated training hours, delivery methods, and any assumptions used in developing the proposed training plan.

313. Question: How many end users, approvers, super users, administrators and executive users require training?

Response: See response to Question 312.

314. Question: Does the Authority prefer train-the-trainer, direct end-user training, role-based training, or a blended model?

Response: The Authority prefers a blended training model that includes role-based training, direct end-user training, and train-the-trainer support. Vendors should propose a training approach that addresses different user groups, system roles, and business processes. The training plan should include training materials, recorded sessions where available, hands-on exercises, knowledge transfer, and support for administrators or super users.

315. Question: Please confirm the expected training audience by role and department, including finance users, procurement users, approvers, executives, administrators, auditors, and support staff. Also confirm the preferred training mode: in-person, virtual, train-the-trainer, role-based, or blended?

Response: See response to Questions 312 and 314.

316. Question: Is training required to be fully in person, or may it be a hybrid of onsite and remote delivery?

Response: Training may be delivered through a hybrid model that includes both onsite and remote delivery.

The Contractor must provide onsite training for key training activities, including role-based end-user training, train-the-trainer sessions, system administrator training, and critical business process training where appropriate. Remote training, recorded sessions, and standard vendor documentation may be used to supplement onsite training.

Offerors must describe the proposed training approach, including onsite and remote training sessions, training hours, user groups, training materials, recordings, hands-on exercises, train-the-trainer support, system administrator training, and any related travel costs.

317. Question: Should training be delivered onsite, virtual, recorded, or hybrid?

Response: See response to Question 316.

318. Question: Is all training to be performed onsite or will any training sessions be able to be done remotely?

Response: See response to Question 316.

319. Question: Does the Authority require training materials in editable format for future internal use?

Response: Yes. The Authority requires training materials to be provided in editable format for future internal use, where available. Vendors should provide materials such as user guides, job aids, process documentation, training decks, and administrator documentation in formats that allow the Authority to update and maintain them after go-live.

320. Question: Are training materials required to be customized to Authority processes, or may standard vendor documentation be supplemented?

Response: Training materials must be customized to the Authority's configured solution, business processes, workflows, roles, approvals, reports, and procedures.

Standard vendor documentation may be used as a supplement, but it must not be the only training material provided. The selected Contractor must provide Authority-specific training materials, including user guides, quick reference guides, SOPs, training decks, administrator documentation, and process documentation that reflect how the Authority will use the system after implementation.

Training materials must be provided in editable format for future internal use where available, and must support end-user training, train-the-trainer sessions, system administrator training, and post-go-live knowledge transfer.

321. Question: Will the Authority assign a dedicated project manager, executive sponsor, and module leads/data owners for the duration of the project?

Response: Yes. The Authority will assign appropriate project governance resources for the duration of the project, including an executive sponsor, Authority project manager or primary project lead, and designated module leads/data owners for key functional areas.

Offerors must identify the Authority roles, responsibilities, estimated time commitments, decision points, and participation needed throughout the project. This includes support for workshops, requirements validation, configuration review, data cleansing, data migration validation, testing/UAT, training, cutover, go-live, and hypercare.

Final Authority project roles, governance structure, meeting cadence, and decision-making process will be confirmed during project planning and kickoff.

322. Question: What level of Authority staff availability should we assume for:

a. Workshops

- b. Requirements validation
- c. Testing
- d. Training
- e. Data cleansing

Response: The Authority will make appropriate subject matter experts, business users, IT resources, Finance staff, Procurement staff, and project stakeholders available to support the implementation.

Offerors must identify the expected level of Authority staff involvement for workshops, requirements validation, testing, training, and data cleansing, including estimated hours, frequency, duration, roles required, and critical decision points. At a minimum, Offerors must assume Authority staff availability for scheduled workshops, requirements review and sign-off, UAT and testing activities, training participation, data review, data cleansing decisions, migration validation, and issue resolution. Final staff availability, meeting cadence, and project resource commitments will be confirmed during project planning and kickoff.

323. Question: Are onsite presence requirements expected during implementation, cutover, and hypercare? If so, what frequency should we assume?

Response: Onsite presence is required during key project activities, including project kickoff, requirements validation, major design sessions, testing/UAT support, training, cutover planning, go-live, and hypercare.

Offerors must propose an onsite and remote delivery plan that identifies onsite activities, frequency, duration, staffing, and all related travel costs. At a minimum, Offerors must assume onsite presence for project kickoff, critical requirements and design sessions, key testing and training activities, cutover/go-live support, and initial hypercare support.

Final onsite schedules and staffing levels will be confirmed during contract negotiation and project planning.

324. Question: The document states 120 days of hypercare and also says hypercare must continue through at least one successful month-end close. Which requirement governs if the month-end close extends beyond 120 days?

Response: The required hypercare period is 120 days after go-live. Hypercare must also continue through at least one successful month-end close and resolution of all critical system issues.

If a successful month-end close has not occurred within the 120-day hypercare period, or if critical system issues remain unresolved, the Authority reserves the right to require continued hypercare support, including use of the optional 30-day hypercare extension.

Offerors must describe how hypercare support will be provided through the required 120-day period, how month-end close support will be handled, and the separate pricing for any optional hypercare extension.

325. Question: Is the optional additional 30-day hypercare extension to be priced in the base proposal or separately?

Response: The optional additional 30-day hypercare extension must be priced separately from the base proposal.

The base proposal must include the required hypercare period identified in the RFP. Offerors must provide separate pricing for the optional 30-day hypercare extension, including staffing, support hours, response times, escalation procedures, included services, exclusions, and any additional costs.

The Authority reserves the right to exercise the optional 30-day hypercare extension based on system performance, operational readiness, unresolved critical issues, or business need.

326. Question: What support coverage is expected during critical periods such as month-end close, year-end close and audit support?

Response: The Authority expects enhanced support availability during critical financial reporting and operational periods, including but not limited to:

- Month-end close
- Quarter-end close
- Fiscal year-end close
- Annual financial statement preparation
- External audit fieldwork and audit support activities
- Budget preparation and budget adoption periods
- Go-live and post-go-live stabilization periods

During these periods, the Authority expects timely access to qualified support personnel capable of assisting with system issues, integrations, reporting, financial processing, and other business-critical functions.

The proposed support model should include:

- Defined support hours and escalation procedures
- Severity-based response and resolution targets
- Access to knowledgeable functional and technical resources
- Support for business-critical financial processing activities
- Assistance with reporting, integrations, and data issues
- Procedures for handling critical incidents and service interruptions

Offerors should describe their standard support model and identify any enhanced support options, dedicated support resources, extended-hours coverage, or additional services available during critical financial and audit periods. Any limitations, exclusions, or additional costs associated with enhanced support should be clearly identified in the proposal.

327. Question: Are we expected to include post-hypercare managed support pricing in the proposal, or only describe the model and SLA?

Response: Offerors must include post-hypercare managed support pricing in the proposal and must also describe the proposed post-hypercare support model and SLA. The response must identify the services included after hypercare, including help desk/ticketing support, functional support, technical support, reporting support, integration support, issue resolution, escalation procedures, response and resolution times, staffing, and availability. Offerors must clearly identify all related pricing, including monthly or annual managed support fees, hourly rates, included support hours, rates for additional support, extended-hours support options, report modifications, enhancement work, and any exclusions or assumptions. The Authority must be able to evaluate both the proposed support model and the total cost of ongoing post-hypercare support.

328. Question: How do you envision the support model after go-live in terms of coverage hours and team involvement.

Response: After go-live, the Authority expects support coverage during normal business hours, Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM Eastern Time. This coverage is acceptable for routine post-go-live and steady-state support. During hypercare, the Contractor must provide appropriate functional and technical support resources familiar with the implementation to assist with issue resolution, user support, reporting, reconciliations, integrations, data validation, and stabilization activities. The Authority's internal team will participate in issue identification, business process validation, user coordination, and priority setting. Offerors must describe the

proposed support model, including support hours, team roles, escalation process, ticketing approach, response times, resolution targets, and any options for extended or emergency support for critical issues.

329. Question: What is the expected duration of hypercare, and under what conditions would the Authority extend it by 30 days?

Response: As stated in Part IV, Section F – Testing, Acceptance and Go-Live, Item 7 – Hypercare, the expected hypercare duration is up to 120 days after go-live. Hypercare must include rapid response, real-time support, immediate assistance, quick incident resolution, proactive monitoring, end-user support, and continued support through at least one successful month-end close and resolution of all critical system issues. The Authority may extend hypercare by up to 30 additional days if needed based on system stabilization, unresolved critical or high-priority issues, month-end close readiness, financial processing needs, reporting or reconciliation issues, integration issues, data validation issues, user support needs, or other business continuity concerns identified during the hypercare period. Offerors must separately identify any costs, assumptions, staffing, service levels, and support coverage associated with the optional 30-day hypercare extension.

330. Question: Should Microsoft cloud availability commitments be passed through, or is the Contractor expected to provide independent uptime guarantees?

Response: Microsoft Cloud availability commitments should be passed through. However, Contractor may provide independent uptime guarantees that exceed those provided by Microsoft to make their offer more advantageous.

331. Question: Does the Authority expect SLA commitments to apply during implementation, hypercare and steady-state support separately?

Response: Yes. As stated in Part IV, Section K – Post-Implementation Support and Transition, Offerors must define hypercare and post-hypercare support models, SLAs, knowledge transfer requirements, and transition plans to steady-state operations in Tab F of their proposal. In addition, Part IV, Section S – Service Level Agreement: System Availability, Performance and Uptime requires Offerors to provide detailed service level commitments for system performance, incident response, issue resolution, service restoration, implementation support, and post-implementation support. SLA commitments must address each applicable phase, including implementation, hypercare, and steady-state/post-hypercare support. Offerors must describe support hours, response times, resolution targets, escalation procedures, severity levels, staffing, communication, ticketing, reporting, and any exclusions or assumptions.

332. Question: What are the expected support hours during month-end close, year-end close and audit periods?

Response: The Authority's normal business hours are expected to be the primary support period; however, enhanced support availability may be required during critical financial reporting and operational periods, including month-end close, year-end close, audit activities, and go-live support.

At a minimum, Offerors should assume support availability during standard business hours and should describe any extended-hours support available for critical issues. The Authority expects clearly defined escalation procedures and timely access to qualified functional and technical resources during critical processing periods.

Offerors should identify:

- Standard support hours
- Extended-hours support availability
- Emergency and after-hours support procedures
- Severity-based response and resolution targets
- Escalation procedures for critical incidents

- **Any additional costs associated with extended-hours or priority support**

The Authority will evaluate support models based on responsiveness, resource availability, escalation procedures, and the ability to support critical financial operations and reporting deadlines.

333. Question: Does the Authority require 24/7 support for critical incidents, or support during normal business hours with extended-hours options?

Response: The Authority does not require 24/7 support for all support requests. Support during normal business hours is acceptable; however, vendors should provide extended-hours or emergency support options for critical incidents, including system outages or issues that materially impact financial operations. Vendors should describe their support hours, critical incident response process, escalation procedures, and any additional costs for after-hours support.

334. Question: Please clarify whether 24/7 support is mandatory or whether support may be provided according to the SLA proposed in Tab F.

Response: See response to Question 333.

335. Question: Please define the expected RTO and RPO targets for disaster recovery and business continuity.

Response: The Authority expects vendors to propose their standard disaster recovery and business continuity capabilities, including recommended RTO and RPO targets for the proposed solution. At a minimum, the proposed ERP solution should support timely recovery of critical financial operations and minimize data loss. Vendors should clearly state their standard RTO and RPO commitments, backup frequency, disaster recovery process, testing schedule, and any options available for enhanced recovery targets.

336. Question: What ticketing platform does the Authority prefer, or can the vendor provide its own service desk system?

Response: The Authority does not have a required ticketing platform for vendor support at this time. Vendors may propose use of their own service desk or ticketing system. The proposed system should allow the Authority to submit, track, prioritize, escalate, and report on support tickets, including response times, resolution status, and SLA performance.

337. Question: What service credits or remedies does the Authority expect for missed SLAs?

Response: The Authority has not established specific service credit or remedy requirements. Offerors are required to propose their standard service level agreements, including any applicable service credits, remedies, or corrective actions, which will be evaluated as part of the proposal. Please refer to section IV-2. of the RFP document.

338. Question: The RFP specifies normal business hours as Monday–Friday 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST and references in-person end-user training in Section IV-G. Outside of the specified in-person training sessions, does the Authority require implementation team members and support staff to work on-site at 701 Market Street, Philadelphia, or may implementation, configuration, data migration, and post-go-live support activities be performed remotely? Please clarify whether any specific project phases or roles require mandatory on-site presence. Please also clarify whether post-hypercare steady-state support is expected to be delivered on-site or remotely.

Response: The Authority expects a hybrid delivery model; however, onsite presence at the Authority's offices is required for key project activities.

At a minimum, Offerors must assume onsite presence for project kickoff, requirements validation, major design/workflow sessions, key testing and UAT support, in-person end-user training, train-the-trainer sessions, system administrator training, cutover planning, go-live support, and initial hypercare support.

Implementation, configuration, data migration, report development, documentation, issue resolution, and other project activities may be performed remotely when appropriate and approved by the Authority, provided the Contractor maintains project schedule, quality, communication, security, and delivery requirements.

Offerors must provide an onsite and remote delivery plan that identifies which phases, roles, and activities will be onsite or remote, including frequency, duration, staffing, travel costs, and assumptions.

Post-hypercare steady-state support may be delivered remotely unless onsite support is specifically requested or required by the Authority for critical issues, major system changes, training, audit support, or other business needs.

339. Question: Are delays caused by Authority dependencies (data, resources, approvals) be excluded from liability? If not, will acceptance of a given milestone be deemed approved if not responded to within an established period of time?

Response: The Authority expects both parties to work collaboratively to identify, communicate, and mitigate project risks, dependencies, and potential delays throughout the implementation.

The Authority recognizes that project timelines may be affected by factors outside the selected Offeror's control, including delays associated with Authority-provided data, resource availability, decisions, approvals, testing participation, or other Authority dependencies. Such matters will be considered when evaluating project schedules, milestones, and any requested schedule adjustments.

The Authority does not intend for milestone approvals, deliverable acceptance, or other contractual rights to be automatically deemed approved solely due to the passage of time. Formal acceptance procedures, review periods, escalation procedures, and approval requirements will be established during contract negotiations and project planning.

Offerors should identify any assumptions regarding Authority responsibilities, review periods, approval timelines, dependencies, and the process for addressing project delays attributable to either party.

340. Question: What level of change management support is expected beyond communications, readiness assessment, and adoption planning?

Response: The Contractor must provide a structured change management approach that goes beyond communications, readiness assessment, and adoption planning.

At a minimum, change management support must include stakeholder analysis, change impact assessment, user readiness activities, role-based adoption support, training coordination, super user support, business process change documentation, resistance/risk tracking, and post-go-live adoption support.

The Contractor must also support Authority leadership and project stakeholders in preparing users for new workflows, system roles, approvals, reporting processes, and changes to current manual or legacy processes. Offerors must describe the specific change management deliverables, tools, meeting cadence, Authority resource needs, and level of support included in the proposal.

341. Question: Do you have any expectations around system usage at peak times or the number of concurrent users?

Response: The Authority's exact peak system usage and number of concurrent users will be confirmed during discovery. Offerors must assume usage may increase during key financial processing periods, including month-end close, invoice processing, payment processing, cash receipt reconciliation, budget/reporting activities, audit support, and high-volume Accounts Receivable billing or reconciliation cycles. The RFP currently anticipates approximately 35 full users and 150 web/team member users. Offerors must describe how the proposed Business Central solution, licensing model, security roles, reporting tools, integrations, and any third-party add-ons will support expected user activity, concurrent usage, peak processing periods, system performance, scalability, and response times.

342. Question: The RFP references NIST SP 800-171 “such as.” Is compliance with NIST required, preferred, or illustrative only?

Response: NIST SP 800-171 is a recognized cybersecurity standard. In this RFP, compliance with NIST SP 800-171 is preferred but not required as a formal certification, because the RFP references it using the phrase “such as.” The reference is intended to be illustrative of the type of recognized cybersecurity framework the Authority expects Offerors to consider. Offerors must describe whether their cybersecurity practices comply with, align with, or differ from NIST SP 800-171 or another comparable recognized cybersecurity framework, and must identify any gaps, assumptions, limitations, and compensating controls for protecting Authority data during implementation, data migration, integrations, support, and ongoing system operations.

343. Question: Are we required to provide SOC 1 and SOC 2 Type II reports for only their own services, or also for any proposed third-party solutions?

Response: Yes. SOC 2 Type 2 compliance is required for the Prime Offeror and any third-party add-on provider that will access, store, process, or transmit Authority data.

344. Question: Microsoft cloud platform where Dynamics 365 is already SOC 2 compliant.

<https://servicetrust.microsoft.com/viewpage/SOC>. Please confirm whether SOC 2 Type 2 compliance is required for the Prime Offeror, teaming partner and third-party add-on providers

Response: SOC 2 Type 2 compliance is required for the Prime Offeror and any third-party add-on provider that will access, store, process, transmit, or support Authority data.

Microsoft Azure and Business Central SaaS SOC 2 certifications may satisfy the requirement for the Microsoft-hosted cloud platform portion of the solution. However, Microsoft’s SOC 2 certifications do not satisfy the SOC 2 Type 2 requirement for the Prime Offeror’s own organization, implementation services, support services, data migration activities, integrations, or any third-party add-on providers.

The Prime Offeror must provide its own current SOC 2 Type 2 report and must identify any third-party providers that will access, store, process, transmit, or support Authority data. The Prime Offeror remains fully responsible for ensuring that all proposed solution components and service providers meet the Authority’s security and compliance requirements.

345. Question: On SOC 2 and Security: Does the SOC 2 Type 2 requirement apply to the Offeror's own organization, to the Microsoft Azure environment, or both? Microsoft's Azure and BC SaaS environments maintain their own SOC 2 certifications — will those satisfy this requirement in whole or in part?

Response: SOC 2 Type 2 compliance is required for the Prime Offeror and any third-party add-on provider that will access, store, process, transmit, or support Authority data. Microsoft Azure and Business Central SaaS SOC 2 certifications may satisfy the requirement for the Microsoft-hosted cloud platform portion of the solution. However, Microsoft’s SOC 2 certifications do not satisfy the SOC 2 Type 2 requirement for the Prime Offeror’s own organization, implementation services, support services, data migration activities, integrations, or any third-party add-on providers.

The Prime Offeror must provide its own current SOC 2 Type 2 report and must identify any third-party providers that will access, store, process, transmit, or support Authority data. The Prime Offeror remains fully responsible for ensuring that all proposed solution components and service providers meet the Authority’s security and compliance requirements.

346. Question: Section II-14 requires Offerors to provide a SOC 2 Type 2 compliance audit, while Part IV, Section L.1 refers to SOC 1 and SOC 2 Type II reports for the contract duration. Please confirm whether SOC 1 is mandatory at proposal submission and/or contract award. We currently do not have SOC 1 certification/audit since we neither access nor process any of the financial information of our clients. Does that imply that SOC 1 can be exempted for us. However, If SOC 1 is required, please clarify whether PPA will accept applicable

Microsoft/Azure/SaaS SOC 1 reports or third-party service provider reports, or whether the Offeror itself must submit its own SOC 1 Type II report?

Response: SOC 2 Type II is required for the Prime Offeror at proposal submission. SOC 1 Type II reporting is also required for the contract duration where financial controls, transaction processing, financial reporting, implementation services, migration, integrations, reporting, support, or related service responsibilities may impact the Authority's financial system or financial data.

Microsoft/Azure/Business Central SaaS SOC 1 and SOC 2 reports may support the compliance documentation for the Microsoft-hosted platform portion of the solution, but they do not replace the Prime Offeror's own SOC 2 Type II requirement.

If the Prime Offeror does not maintain its own SOC 1 Type II report, the Offeror must clearly identify how SOC 1 coverage will be satisfied through the Prime Offeror, Microsoft/Azure/Business Central SaaS, or applicable third-party service providers. The Prime Offeror must also identify any third-party providers that will access, store, process, transmit, or support Authority data and must provide applicable SOC 1, SOC 2, or other security and compliance documentation for those providers.

347. Question: Please clarify whether a PCI DSS Attestation of Compliance (AOC) is required when the proposed solution utilizes a PCI DSS-compliant third-party payment processing system.

Our understanding is that the third-party payment provider is responsible for maintaining PCI DSS compliance and its Attestation of Compliance when storing, processing, or transmitting cardholder data.

Based on this architecture, please confirm if there is a requirement to store, process, or transmit credit card holder data. If not, is there still a requirement for PCI DSS Attestation of Compliance requirement by Prime Contractor.

Response: The Authority does not intend for Business Central or the Prime Contractor to store, process, or transmit credit cardholder data directly. The Authority uses PCI DSS-compliant payment vendors and banking platforms for payment processing. If the Prime Contractor, proposed solution, integration, add-on, or support process will store, process, transmit, or access cardholder data, the Prime Contractor must provide applicable PCI DSS compliance documentation. Otherwise, the Prime Contractor must confirm that cardholder data will remain outside of Business Central and the Prime Contractor's operating environment.

348. Question: Are there any additional Authority-specific security policies, retention schedules, backup requirements, or audit standards that should be assumed?

Response: The Authority maintains information security, records retention, business continuity, disaster recovery, internal control, and audit compliance requirements that must be adhered to by the selected Offeror. Detailed requirements will be reviewed during contract negotiations, discovery, and implementation planning.

Offerors should assume that the proposed solution must support industry-standard security, retention, backup, recovery, and audit capabilities, including but not limited to:

- **Role-based security and segregation of duties**
- **Multi-factor authentication (MFA) and secure access controls**
- **Audit logging and audit trail functionality**
- **Data encryption in transit and at rest**
- **Backup and recovery capabilities**
- **Business continuity and disaster recovery support**
- **Records retention and data retention capabilities**

- User activity monitoring and reporting
- Compliance with applicable governmental, financial, and audit requirements

The Authority expects the selected Offeror to identify any assumptions, prerequisites, limitations, shared responsibilities, licensing requirements, or third-party dependencies associated with security, retention, backup, recovery, and compliance functionality.

Offerors should also describe how the proposed solution supports audit readiness, internal controls, data governance, and long-term records retention requirements.

349. Question: Are there any additional compliance requirements beyond SOC 2 and PCI that we should take into account, given the public sector environment

Response:Yes. In addition to SOC 2 and PCI DSS where applicable, Offerors must consider public-sector security, data governance, audit, and records requirements. At a minimum, the proposed solution and services must support applicable requirements related to U.S.-based Azure data storage, role-based security, audit logging, data retention, incident response, data ownership, disaster recovery/business continuity, and applicable data handling frameworks such as NIST SP 800-171. Offerors must describe how the proposed solution, implementation approach, third-party tools, and support model will meet these compliance requirements and must identify any assumptions, limitations, or additional documentation required.

350. Question: Will the Authority provide demonstration scripts or should Offerors propose their own demonstration scenarios?

Response: The Authority will provide demonstration scripts to shortlisted Offerors. Offerors should follow the provided scripts and may include additional scenarios, if time permits, to further demonstrate how their proposed solution meets the Authority's requirements.

351. Question: Does the Authority require all implementation resources to be U.S.-based due to public-sector, security or data governance requirements?

Response: The Authority does not require all implementation resources to be U.S.-based; however, vendors must clearly disclose any offshore or nearshore resources proposed for the project. Vendors should identify the roles, work locations, responsibilities, data access requirements, and security controls for any non-U.S.-based resources. The Authority reserves the right to restrict or approve resource locations based on public-sector, security, confidentiality, or data governance requirements.

352. Question: On Data and Staffing: Given the North America data residency requirement in the sample contract, are there any restrictions on where implementation team members may be physically located, provided all data access and processing occurs within U.S.-based Azure environments? (onshore/offshore)?

Response: The Authority prefers onshore resources for implementation, data migration, configuration, testing, support, and any activities involving access to Authority data.

Offshore or nearshore resources are not preferred and must not be used unless clearly disclosed in the proposal and approved by the Authority. Offerors must identify the physical location of all proposed resources, their roles, data access requirements, supervision model, security controls, and support responsibilities.

All Authority data must remain stored and processed within U.S.-based Azure environments. The Prime Contractor remains fully responsible for all work performed by its employees, subcontractors, teaming partners, offshore resources, nearshore resources, third-party providers, and support personnel.

353. Question: Beyond ERP modernization, are you looking to create a digital platform using AI, automation, self-service portals, and analytics over the next 2–3 years?

Response: The Authority's primary objective under this procurement is the successful implementation, support, and modernization of its core financial and operational systems through Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central.

However, the Authority recognizes the value of emerging technologies and anticipates continuing its digital transformation efforts over the next several years. Areas of potential future interest may include:

- Workflow automation and process optimization
- Enhanced self-service reporting and analytics
- Executive dashboards and business intelligence
- Data integration and data governance initiatives
- Electronic document management and workflow solutions
- Vendor, employee, and stakeholder self-service capabilities
- Artificial intelligence and machine-assisted business processes
- Predictive analytics and data-driven decision support
- Advanced automation of financial and operational processes

The Authority has not established a formal roadmap for these initiatives as part of this procurement and does not require Offerors to include such capabilities unless specifically identified in the RFP requirements.

Offerors are encouraged to describe the scalability, extensibility, automation, analytics, artificial intelligence, and digital transformation capabilities available within their proposed solution and how those capabilities may support the Authority's future business objectives.

354. Question: Which business decisions are currently delayed because data is spread across multiple systems?

Response: The Authority maintains financial and operational information across multiple systems and data sources. As a result, certain reporting, reconciliation, and analysis activities may require the collection, validation, and consolidation of data from multiple locations before information is available for management review and decision-making.

Examples of activities that may require data consolidation include:

- Budget-to-actual reporting and financial performance analysis
- Cash management and cash flow monitoring
- Accounts payable and procurement reporting
- Payroll and labor cost analysis
- Management and executive reporting
- Interfund reconciliations
- Audit support and compliance reporting
- Operational and departmental performance reporting

The Authority's objective is to improve data accessibility, reporting efficiency, and decision-making through the implementation of an integrated solution that reduces manual processes, improves data consistency, and provides timely access to reliable information.

Offerors should describe how their proposed solution supports integrated reporting, dashboards, analytics, and data visibility across functional areas.

355. Question: What reporting or audit requirements cannot be met efficiently in Dynamics GP today?

Response: The Authority continues to meet its financial reporting, management reporting, budget reporting, regulatory reporting, and audit requirements utilizing Microsoft Dynamics GP and related reporting tools. However, many reporting and analytical processes require the use of multiple systems, spreadsheets, manual data consolidation, custom reports, and supplemental analysis.

The Authority is seeking a modern, integrated solution that improves reporting efficiency, data accessibility, workflow automation, analytics, audit support, and long-term system supportability.

Areas where the Authority seeks improvement include:

- Self-service reporting and analytics
- Dashboarding and executive reporting
- Budget-to-actual reporting and analysis
- Consolidation of data from multiple sources
- Workflow visibility and audit trails
- Ad hoc reporting capabilities
- Data integration and reporting consistency
- Reduction of manual processes and spreadsheet dependencies
- Enhanced support for audit and compliance activities

The Authority expects the selected Offeror to identify opportunities to streamline reporting, improve data visibility, and enhance operational efficiency through the implementation of Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central and related technologies.

356. Question: What are the top 3 business challenges with the current Dynamics GP system?

Response: The Authority continues to successfully operate Microsoft Dynamics GP; however, the Authority is seeking a modernized platform to improve efficiency, reporting, integration, and long-term supportability.

The Authority's primary business challenges include:

1. Reliance on Multiple Systems and Manual Processes

Many business processes require the use of multiple systems, spreadsheets, manual data consolidation, and supplemental analysis to support financial reporting, budgeting, payroll accounting, procurement, cash management, and audit activities.

2. Reporting and Data Accessibility

While the Authority is able to meet its reporting requirements, obtaining timely management information often requires data extraction, report customization, reconciliation, and analysis across multiple systems and reporting tools. The Authority seeks improved self-service reporting, dashboards, analytics, and real-time visibility into financial and operational information.

3. Modernization and Long-Term Supportability

The Authority seeks a modern cloud-based platform that provides improved workflow automation, integration capabilities, security, scalability, user experience, and long-term vendor support while reducing reliance on legacy processes and custom solutions.

The Authority expects the selected Offeror to demonstrate how the proposed Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central solution will address these challenges while supporting operational efficiency, financial reporting, internal controls, and future growth.

357. Question: What are the top three business problems this project must solve?

Response: See response to Question 356.

358. Question: Please confirm the key business pain points and measurable success criteria for this ERP modernization initiative, including finance close, procurement controls, reporting, audit readiness, data quality, and user experience goals.

Response: The Authority's ERP modernization initiative is intended to improve operational efficiency, reporting capabilities, internal controls, data accessibility, workflow automation, and long-term system supportability.

Key Business Pain Points

Finance and Close Process

- Reliance on manual processes, spreadsheets, and data consolidation activities
- Time-consuming reconciliations and reporting activities
- Data maintained across multiple systems and reporting tools

Procurement and Internal Controls

- Opportunities to improve workflow automation, approval visibility, audit trails, and process efficiency
- Desire for greater standardization and transparency throughout the procure-to-pay process

Reporting and Analytics

- Dependence on multiple reporting tools and manual report preparation
- Limited self-service reporting capabilities for business users
- Need for improved management dashboards and real-time visibility into financial and operational data

Audit and Compliance

- Significant effort required to compile supporting documentation and audit schedules
- Desire for improved audit trails, data accessibility, and reporting consistency

Data Management

- Data maintained across multiple systems and repositories
- Need for improved integration, consistency, governance, and accessibility

User Experience

- Desire for a modern, intuitive user interface and improved workflow efficiency
- Need for improved accessibility of information and reduced dependence on technical resources

Desired Outcomes and Success Criteria

The Authority anticipates that a successful implementation will achieve the following objectives:

- Improved efficiency of month-end, quarter-end, and year-end close processes
- Increased workflow automation and approval visibility

- **Reduction in manual data entry and spreadsheet-based processes**
- **Improved data quality and consistency across systems**
- **Enhanced self-service reporting and analytics capabilities**
- **Improved audit readiness and accessibility of supporting documentation**
- **Enhanced integration between business systems**
- **Increased user adoption and satisfaction**
- **Improved management reporting and executive visibility into financial and operational performance**
- **Successful migration to a modern, secure, supportable cloud-based platform**

Offerors should describe how their proposed solution and implementation approach will address these business challenges and how project success can be measured following implementation.

359. Question: Can you help us understand what the key goals are for this ERP transformation and what success would look like from your perspective?

Response: See response to Question 358.

360. Question: It would be helpful to understand what the main challenges are with your current Dynamics GP system that you are aiming to resolve with this transition?

Response: See response to Question 358.

361. Question: RFP states that MB-800 certification documentation for assigned team members is required with additional certificates including MB-820, MB-920, PL-200, AZ-104. All certs must remain current for contract duration. While we do have team members with the above-mentioned certificates, the resources themselves may be deployed on ad hoc basis on projects which are initiated. How important is it for PPA that only the named resources in the Proposal response must be available for this engagement and is it possible if we deploy other resources with similar experience and certifications at the time of contract award, based on resource availability?

Response: See response to Question 9.

362. Question: What is the desired project start date?

Response: The project will start after contract execution and implementation must start no later than April 1, 2027.

363. Question: Are there any known technical risks?

Response: See responses to Questions 34, 133-136.

364. Question: Are there any known organizational or change management risks?

Response: As with any enterprise system implementation, the Authority recognizes that organizational change management, user adoption, training, business process alignment, resource availability, and competing operational priorities represent potential project risks.

The Authority anticipates that key change management considerations may include:

- **Transitioning users from existing business processes and legacy systems**
- **User adoption of new workflows and system functionality**
- **Training and knowledge transfer requirements**
- **Balancing project participation with ongoing operational responsibilities**

- Data migration and data validation activities
- Business process standardization and optimization
- Coordination among multiple departments and stakeholders
- Maintaining business continuity during implementation and go-live

The Authority expects the selected Offeror to provide a comprehensive change management, communication, training, and user adoption strategy as part of the implementation approach. Offerors should describe their experience managing organizational change, user readiness, stakeholder engagement, and adoption activities for similar Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central implementations.

365. Question: Are significant business process changes anticipated during the implementation?

Response: The Authority anticipates that certain business processes may be reviewed, refined, standardized, and improved as part of the implementation. However, the primary objective of the project is not a comprehensive business process reengineering initiative.

The Authority expects the selected Offeror to evaluate current business processes, identify opportunities to leverage standard Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central functionality, and recommend process improvements that enhance efficiency, internal controls, reporting, workflow automation, and user experience.

Potential areas for process improvement may include:

- Procurement and purchasing workflows
- Accounts payable processing
- Budgeting and financial reporting
- Approval workflows and delegation processes
- Data management and reporting
- Integration and data exchange processes
- Month-end and year-end close activities
- Audit support and compliance processes

The Authority prefers to adopt leading practices and standard Business Central functionality where practical while minimizing unnecessary customizations and disruption to critical business operations.

Offerors should describe their approach to business process review, process optimization, change management, and the implementation of standard Business Central functionality.

END OF ADDENDUM TWO