

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

RFP No. 26-17
Background Verification Services
Addendum Two

To: See Email Distribution List

From: Shannon Stewart
Manager of Contract Administration

Date: October 14, 2026

No Pages: 11 plus Appendix A

This addendum is issued on October 14, 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. **Proposal Due Date: The Proposal Due Date has been extended to Monday, October 26, 2026 at 1:00 PM.**
2. **Appendix A - Proposal Form: Section 2 is revised as follows:**

The Authority reserves the right to withdraw and cancel this RFP prior to opening or to reject any and all proposals after proposals are opened if in the best interest of the Authority, in the Authority's sole discretion. If the Authority accepts Offeror's offer, Offeror agrees to execute a contract memorializing the proposal's terms if the contract is delivered to Offeror within 90 days of the proposal opening date. This provision will not be interpreted to preclude the execution of a contract related to this proposal outside of that ~~60~~ **90**-day period.

3. **Appendix C – Insurance Requirements: The insurance requirements have been revised, please see Appendix A of this addendum.**

QUESTIONS

1. **Question:** During the Pre-Proposal Meeting, the Authority indicated that government access fees and other pass-through fees should be included in Cost Form pricing. Certain required services, including county criminal searches, state MVRs, New York OCA searches, education verifications, and other jurisdictional searches, may incur mandatory fees that vary substantially by jurisdiction. Will the Authority permit Offerors to invoice mandatory government, court, repository, institution, and similar access fees at actual cost as incurred, in addition to the fixed service fees on the Cost Form?

Response: Any applicable pass-through fees will be paid at direct cost with no mark-up, the selected Offeror will need to submit an invoice evidencing any pass-through fees incurred. See response to Question 7 of Addendum #1 for additional information.

2. **Question:** If all government and third-party access fees must be included in fixed pricing, please provide the historical jurisdiction/service mix or other pricing assumptions Offerors should use to account for these variable fees and permit comparable pricing among Offerors.

Response: See response to Question 1.

3. **Question:** The Cost Form provides pricing for “Provided Name” and “Provided Name and Three Aliases.” Please confirm that “Provided Name and Three Aliases” is intended to be a fixed price inclusive of up to three aliases and clarify how aliases exceeding three should be priced.

Response: The intent is one fixed service price for the provided name and up to three additional aliases. Offerors must identify any fees for names exceeding 3 aliases in section C of their cost form.

4. **Question:** Please confirm that the Industry Standard Criminal Check requires county felony and misdemeanor searches in all locations identified during the applicant’s seven-year address/name history.

Response: Yes. The Industry Standard package must include county felony and misdemeanor searches for all counties of residence identified through the applicant's seven-year address history, using applicant information and the SSN/address trace. Searches must cover the names included in the selected pricing option, subject to applicable reporting limitations.

5. **Question:** For applicants who have lived in multiple counties during the seven-year period, is the County Criminal component expected to include all identified counties within the quoted package price, regardless of the number of counties identified?

Response: Yes. The service price for the all-residence county component is to cover all identified counties within the seven-year scope, without any additional fees for each county. Applicable court and other mandatory access fees may be separately itemized. Additional costs for searches outside the package scope must be separately identified in section C of the Revised Cost Form.

6. **Question:** Please clarify when the Authority anticipates ordering the Pennsylvania Access to Criminal History (PATCH) package rather than the Industry Standard Criminal Check and whether PATCH replaces Pennsylvania county criminal searches when ordered.

Response: The Authority intends to retain both the Industry Standard screening option and a Pennsylvania State Police PATCH option. The Authority will identify the required services when placing an order.

7. **Question:** For Motor Vehicle Records, does the Authority require each state’s mandatory DMV/MVR access fee to be included within the fixed Cost Form price regardless of the state in which the applicant is licensed?

Response: No. The fixed MVR service fee may be quoted separately from the applicable state's mandatory DMV access fee. The state fee must be separately identified and must not be duplicated where already included in a quoted price.

8. **Question:** The Work Statement references verification of education, training, certifications, and licensed credentials, while the Cost Form identifies “Education - Highest Degree.” Please confirm that Highest Degree verification is the education verification included in the standard package and that additional certification, training, and professional-license verifications may be ordered and priced separately.

Response: Yes. Highest-degree verification is the education component of the standard screening packages. Additional training, certification, professional-license, and other credential verifications should remain available as separately priced services when requested by the Authority. International verification and institutional access charges must be clearly identified in section C of the Offeror's cost form.

9. **Question:** The RFP states that background-check results must be emailed to the applicant. Will secure electronic delivery or secure applicant portal access to the completed consumer report satisfy this requirement?

Response: Yes. Secure electronic delivery through an authenticated applicant portal, accompanied by an email notification and access to the completed report, is acceptable. The solution must allow the applicant to obtain a copy and must protect sensitive information.

- 10. Question:** Please clarify the scope of the required electronic Form I-9 service. Is the requirement limited to electronic completion and storage of new Forms I-9, or does the Authority expect the selected Offeror to provide substantive Form I-9 compliance services?
- Response:** The intended addition is an electronic I-9 solution for new hires that supports form completion, electronic signatures, document handling, secure storage, and connection to the associated E-Verify process. And if possible, integrate with the Dayforce system.
- 11. Question:** Does the Authority expect the selected Offeror to review completed Forms I-9 for errors, omissions, and deficiencies and provide correction/remediation workflows before or in connection with creation of the associated E-Verify case?
- Response:** The proposed electronic I-9 solution must identify missing or inconsistent required entries and support documented corrections before or in connection with E-Verify case creation, as appropriate.
- 12. Question:** Does the Authority require the electronic I-9 solution to provide compliance validation, correction workflows, reverification/expiring work-authorization management, retention management, and complete electronic audit trails?
- Response:** Yes, the electronic I-9 solution must include completion validation, correction workflows, reverification and expiration tracking where applicable, retention management, and an electronic audit trail. Offerors must detail these capabilities and any limitations in Tab F of their proposals.
- 13. Question:** Does the Authority expect the selected Offeror to provide Form I-9 compliance support to the Authority in the event of a DHS, ICE, or other government Form I-9 inspection or audit?
- Response:** The Authority expects access to retained electronic forms, supporting records, audit trails, and support if the Authority receives an inspection or audit request.
- 14. Question:** Appendix B prohibits subcontracting of all or part of the work covered by the Contract. Please confirm whether the selected Offeror must itself provide the required electronic Form I-9, E-Verify, Form I-9 compliance/audit, and related support services rather than subcontracting those required services to another provider.
- Response:** The selected Offeror will remain responsible for delivering and supporting the required services. Offerors must identify any proposed third-party service arrangement, responsibilities, and data access. Offerors are permitted to use third-party platforms to conduct search, such as courts, federal/state; these are not considered subcontractors.
- 15. Question:** Does the Authority require or prefer the selected Offeror to be an authorized E-Verify Employer Agent capable of creating and managing E-Verify cases on the Authority's behalf? If so, should Offerors provide documentation of their Employer Agent status and experience?
- Response:** Offerors must describe how E-Verify cases will be created, managed, and supported. If the proposed model involves the Offeror acting as an E-Verify Employer Agent on the Authority's behalf, the Offeror must identify and document that status and its relevant experience.
- 16. Question:** Given the Authority's requirement for electronic Form I-9 and E-Verify services, should Offerors identify their years of direct experience conducting Form I-9 compliance audits, correcting deficient Forms I-9, maintaining electronic I-9 audit trails, and supporting employers during government Form I-9 inspections?
- Response:** Offerors should describe their experience providing electronic I-9 and E-Verify services and the qualifications of the personnel supporting implementation and operations in Tab B of their proposal. Experience with audits, remediation, and government inspections may also be described.
- 17. Question:** Is the Philadelphia Parking Authority currently enrolled in and using E-Verify? If so, are E-Verify cases presently processed directly by the Authority or through an E-Verify Employer Agent?

Response: No.

- 18. Question:** Does the Authority expect the selected Offeror to provide ongoing electronic management and retention of the Authority's existing Forms I-9 in addition to Forms I-9 completed for new hires?

Response: Yes, and the Authority must be able to access if/when the contract ends.

- 19. Question:** Does the Authority expect the selected Offeror to convert and migrate existing paper and/or electronic Forms I-9 and associated documentation into the selected Offeror's electronic I-9 system?

Response: No, but Offerors may describe and separately price an optional migration service, including its assumptions and required record formats in section C of their cost form.

- 20. Question:** Does the Authority expect the selected Offeror to review existing Forms I-9 for errors, omissions, deficiencies, retention requirements, and required reverification and provide a process for remediation of identified issues?

Response: A review or remediation of the Authority's historical Forms I-9 is not included in the proposed base scope. The new system should support routine validation, corrections, retention, and applicable reverification for records created in that system. Any historical audit or remediation service should be separately described and priced in section C of the cost form.

- 21. Question:** If existing Forms I-9 are to be maintained, migrated, reviewed, or remediated, approximately how many active and terminated employee Form I-9 records does the Authority currently maintain, and in what format are those records maintained?

Response: There are approximately 1250 I-9's stored in paper format.

- 22. Question:** If existing Forms I-9 are to be converted, migrated, reviewed, audited, or remediated, may Offerors separately price those services as part of implementation?

Response: Yes, any additional checks or services not included in the Work Statement must be identified in section C of the cost form.

- 23. Question:** Does the Authority require reporting specifically related to Form I-9 compliance, including missing or incomplete Forms I-9, correction status, expiring work authorization, reverification requirements, retention dates, E-Verify status, and audit readiness?

Response: Yes.

- 24. Question:** Please identify the specific applicant and employee information the Authority expects to transmit from Dayforce to the selected Offeror and the specific information expected to be transmitted back into Dayforce, including background-screening status/disposition, Form I-9 status, E-Verify status, reports/documents, or other information.

Response: The integration must transfer the applicant's demographic and identifying information needed to initiate selected background-screening services and the new I-9/E-Verify workflow. Completed background results and status updates must return to the appropriate Dayforce profile. The proposed new workflow must return I-9 completion and E-Verify case status, with secure access to supporting records where supported. Exact fields, document transfer versus secure links, permissions, and data mapping will be established during implementation.

- 25. Question:** Does the Authority expect the electronic Form I-9 and E-Verify workflow to be initiated through the Dayforce integration, or may the selected Offeror provide a separate secure electronic workflow integrated with the Authority's hiring process?

Response: The Authority expects the electronic Form I-9 and E-Verify workflow to be initiated through the Dayforce integration.

26. Question: Does the Authority currently have an integration between Dayforce and its incumbent background-screening and/or I-9 provider? If so, please describe the current workflow the Authority expects the selected Offeror to replace.

Response: No.

27. Question: Does the Authority have a preferred Dayforce integration method, such as API or SFTP, or should Offerors propose the method they believe is most appropriate?

Response: API is preferred but Offerors may propose the method they believe is most appropriate in Tab F of their proposal.

28. Question: May an Offeror identify a one-time Dayforce integration/implementation fee separately from the per-transaction fees shown on the Cost Form, or must all implementation and integration costs be incorporated into transactional pricing?

Response: Yes, Offerors should include a separate one-time integration/implementation fee in section C of the cost form.

29. Question: During the Pre-Proposal Meeting, the Authority emphasized the need for robust reporting. Please identify the principal reports, dashboards, scheduled reports, and organizational/user-level reporting capabilities the Authority expects the selected Offeror to provide.

Response: The proposed reporting baseline includes individual results, pending and completed orders, service volumes, turnaround times, and charges by service and reporting period. The new services should add I-9 completion and E-Verify status reporting. Offerors must describe available filters, authorized-user access, exports formats, dashboards, and scheduling capabilities in Tab F of their proposals.

30. Question: Appendix B states that subcontracting of all or part of the work is prohibited. Background screening providers routinely utilize courts, government repositories, court researchers, educational institutions, motor vehicle agencies, data providers, and other third-party record and verification sources. Please confirm that use of these normal-course sources and providers does not constitute prohibited subcontracting.

Response: See response to Question 14.

31. Question: Appendix C contemplates subcontractors while Appendix B states that subcontracting is prohibited. Please clarify the intended distinction between prohibited subcontracting and permissible third-party service providers, data providers, researchers, and other vendors used in the normal course of performing background verification services.

Response: See response to Question 14.

32. Question: Appendix B contains indemnification obligations that include special, consequential, and incidental damages without an express limitation of liability. Will the Authority consider excluding indirect, incidental, special, exemplary, punitive, and consequential damages and establishing a commercially reasonable limitation of liability, subject to customary exceptions?

Response: Any exceptions or requested changes to the Sample Contract must be clearly noted in Tab H of the Proposal in order to be considered.

33. Question: Appendix B permits termination by the Authority on five days' written notice. Will the Authority consider a thirty-day notice period for termination without cause?

Response: Any exceptions or requested changes to the Sample Contract must be clearly noted in Tab H of the Proposal in order to be considered.

- 34. Question:** Appendix B's Order of Precedence gives the main Agreement and RFP precedence over the selected Offeror's Proposal. Please confirm that any exceptions or negotiated provisions accepted by the Authority in Tab H will be incorporated into the final Agreement and control over inconsistent provisions.
- Response:** Any exceptions or requested changes to the Sample Contract via Tab H that are accepted by the Authority will be included in the final contract.
- 35. Question:** The potential contract term extends for up to ten years. If a government agency, court, repository, DMV, educational institution, or other third-party record source establishes a new mandatory fee or materially increases an existing fee during the contract term, may the selected Offeror pass through that increase notwithstanding the pricing submitted for the applicable contract year?
- Response:** See response to Question 1.
- 36. Question:** Please confirm whether the Authority will accept an Offeror's existing insurance program where coverage is substantially equivalent to Appendix C or whether every coverage provision and endorsement must be satisfied exactly as written.
- Response:** The selected Offeror will be required to provide a certificate of insurance that meets the exact language found in Appendix C of the RFP document.
- 37. Question:** Appendix C requires \$1,000,000 Crime Liability coverage including Employee Theft of Client Property and naming the Authority as Loss Payee. Will the Authority accept equivalent crime/fidelity coverage that provides materially equivalent protection if the carrier's standard endorsement differs from the wording in Appendix C?
- Response:** Yes.
- 38. Question:** Appendix C requires thirty days' written notice of cancellation, material change, or non-renewal to the Authority by Certified Mail. Will the Authority accept the insurer's standard notice-of-cancellation endorsement where the carrier cannot contractually provide direct certified-mail notice of all material changes or non-renewals?
- Response:** Yes. Please note section 10 of the Insurance requirements contain updated language, please see Appendix A of this addendum.
- 39. Question:** May Offerors propose annual adjustments to service fees for renewal years based upon a stated index or percentage, or must the prices entered for Years 2-10 remain fixed exactly as submitted?
- Response:** See response to Question 6 of Addendum #1.
- 40. Question:** Please confirm that electronic Form I-9, E-Verify, Military Service Verification, implementation, historical I-9 migration/audit/remediation, and other services not represented in the original pricing tables may be separately priced in the revised Cost Form or Add Alternate section.
- Response:** Yes, they may be separately priced in section C of the revised Cost Form.
- 41. Question:** Approximately how many new Forms I-9 and E-Verify cases does the Authority anticipate annually?
- Response:** Approximately 400 annually.
- 42. Question:** Does the estimated 25-30 background checks per month include promotional opportunities and internal candidates, or are those additional to the estimate?
- Response:** Yes, the estimated 25-30 checks per month includes promotions and internal applications.
- 43. Question:** Does the Authority anticipate that all new hires will receive the complete Industry Standard Criminal Check, or will screening packages vary by position or job classification?
- Response:** Yes, all new hires will receive the complete Industry Standard Criminal Check.

44. Question: Please identify the Authority's desired implementation timeline following contract award and whether the Authority anticipates a transition period with the incumbent provider.

Response: The Authority anticipates implementation to be completed within 60 days of contract award.

45. Question: The Cost Form requires a price for each individual component and a "Total" for the Industry Standard Criminal Check and PATCH packages, while the Work Statement (IV-2) requires the ability to order services individually. Bundled package pricing in this industry is typically lower than the sum of the same services ordered à la carte. Please confirm that the package "Total" column may reflect a bundled/package price that is less than the sum of the individual component prices, and that the individual component prices will apply only when services are ordered separately. If so, please also confirm which figure(s) the Evaluation Committee will use when scoring price (the package total, the component prices, or both).

Response: Please see Appendix A of Addendum #1.

46. Question: May Offerors attach a supplemental pricing schedule (e.g., in Tab E or Tab L) to clarify package vs. à la carte pricing, pass-through fees, and pricing assumptions without it being considered an alteration of the Proposal Form?

Response: See response to Question 1 and Appendix A of Addendum #1.

47. Question: Background screening costs include mandatory third-party/government fees outside the Offeror's control (e.g., county court access fees, state MVR fees, PATCH fees set by the Pennsylvania State Police, and fees charged by some schools or verification clearinghouses). Section 3.C states pricing shall include all charges/levies. Will the Authority permit these statutory/third-party fees to be billed as pass-through at cost, separate from the Offeror's service fee? If not, how should Offerors account for future changes in these government-set fees over a potential 10-year term?

Response: See response to Question 1.

48. Question: Should prices for Years 2–10 be firm fixed prices, or may Offerors propose an annual escalator (e.g., a fixed percentage or CPI-based)? If government pass-through fees change during the term, will pricing be adjusted accordingly?

Response: See Appendix A of Addendum #1 for revised Cost Form and see response to Question 1 regarding pass-through fees.

49. Question: Military Service Verification, Electronic I-9, and E-Verify are required services in the Work Statement but do not appear in the Cost Form tables A or B. Should these be priced in Section C ("Add Alternate: Additional Services")? Please confirm that including required services in Section C will not cause them to be treated as optional in the evaluation.

Response: Please see Appendix A of Addendum #1.

50. Question: Please confirm the definition of an alias for pricing purposes (e.g., maiden names and other names developed from the SSN trace). Should names beyond three be priced separately, and is there a preferred per-additional-name price format?

Response: Any names developed from the SSN trace are considered alias. The intent is one fixed service price for the provided name and up to three additional aliases. Offerors must identify their charge and billing unit for names exceeding that allowance in section C of their cost form.

51. Question: Regarding 5.A Cost Form, "County Criminal Felony & Misdemeanor -All Lived - 7 Year History" Please confirm this line item should be priced as an all-inclusive price covering every county of residence identified in the 7-year address history, regardless of the number of counties, or whether a per-county price is preferred.

Response: The all-residence seven-year county line must be quoted as one cost covering all counties within that scope, rather than a separate service fee per county.

- 52. Question:** Please define the expected scope of "Global Watch" (e.g., OFAC, global sanctions, terrorist watch lists, debarment lists). For "Education – Highest Degree," please confirm whether international degree verifications and high school/GED verifications are included in the base price or should be priced separately.

Response: Global Watch reports include individuals who have committed, pose a risk for committing, or supported terrorist acts, fraud, money laundering, smuggling, and other domestic and international criminal activity. Degree verifications and high school/GED verifications must be included in the package price identified in section B of the cost form.

- 53. Question:** Cost Form 5.B (PATCH) does not include a County Criminal search. Please clarify when the Authority will use the PATCH package versus the Industry Standard package (e.g., positions with specific statutory requirements), and the expected volume split between the two. Should the PATCH fee be listed at the current PSP fee as a pass-through?

Response: The Authority does not have an estimated quantity for when each will be used. Offerors must provide pricing in section B of their cost form for each package.

- 54. Question:** The RFP estimates 25–30 background checks per month. Can the Authority provide (a) the approximate split between new hires and promotional candidates, (b) the percentage of checks requiring an MVR and/or CDL review, and (c) the approximate percentage of candidates with out-of-state address history?

Response: A majority of the background checks are for new hires. The number of MVR/CDL reviews varies and out of state candidates are very low. Exact quantities are not available at this time.

- 55. Question:** Please clarify the turnaround requirement: does "performed within 24–48 hours" mean the searches must be initiated within 24–48 hours of request, with complete results due within 7 calendar days? Please confirm that delays caused by factors outside the Offeror's control (e.g., court closures, clerk-required record retrieval, unresponsive schools or employers, or candidate delay in completing consent) are excluded from the 7-day requirement, provided the Authority's project manager is notified.

Response: The intent is to have results within 48 hours but if there are outside factors delaying results, the selected Offeror must notify the Authority's project manager via email and provide an updated ETA.

- 56. Part IV-2, A.1 references "all current and past criminal records at the Federal, State, and Local levels," while the Cost Form specifies a 7-year county search. Should a Federal District Court criminal search and/or a statewide criminal repository search be included in the Industry Standard package? Please also confirm the Authority's expectations are subject to FCRA and applicable state reporting limitations.**

Response: The base Industry Standard Criminal Check package includes the seven-year county search, and a broad criminal-record database search with potential records verified at the primary source. Federal district searches and standalone statewide repository searches should remain separately available, and the costs must be identified in section C of the cost form. They are not automatically added to every package. The selected Offeror must support the broader federal, state, and local search capabilities.

- 57. Question:** Part IV-2, A.4 states results must be emailed to the applicant. Is delivery via a secure, encrypted candidate portal with an email notification acceptable, to protect sensitive PII? (b) Is display of a masked/truncated SSN on reports acceptable in lieu of the full SSN?

Response: Offerors should provide industry standard secure applicant-portal access to deliver results to candidates and masked truncated SSNs on reports are acceptable in lieu of the full SSN.

58. Question: Does the Authority want the Offeror to manage the FCRA pre-adverse and adverse action notification process on its behalf? Does the Authority follow the Philadelphia Fair Criminal Record Screening Standards Ordinance, and if so, would it like workflow support for the individualized assessment/notice requirements?

Response: Yes, the selected Offeror will manage the FCRA pre-adverse and adverse action notification process on the Authority's behalf. The Authority follows the PA hiring Criminal History Record Information Act (CHRIA - 18 Pa.C.S. § 9125)

59. Question: Please confirm the Authority's current HRMS/ATS environment: is the Authority using Dayforce Recruiting as its ATS, and are applicants initiated from Dayforce for background checks today? Does the Authority have a target go-live date for the integration, and is it required at contract start or may it be phased in?

Response: The Authority is in the infancy stages of the Dayforce go-live for HRMS and ATS. Applicants will be initiated from Dayforce for background checks once an Offeror is selected. Currently the process is completed through Accurate Background Screening. The Authority's target go-live date for integration is within 60 days of contract award.

60. Question: Is there an incumbent provider for these services? If so, please identify the incumbent and provide the current pricing and annual spend under the existing contract.

Response: Yes, the Authority currently obtains background-screening services from Accurate Background Screening. See Appendix B of Addendum #1 for current pricing. The September 2026 invoice totals \$958.87, including \$202.00 in pass-through fees. These are historical contract prices and one month's invoiced spend, not verified current unit rates, annual spend, or a required pricing ceiling for proposals. Annual spend information is not available at this time.

61. Question: Background screening necessarily relies on third-party sources such as court researchers/record retrievers, state DMV record providers, education clearinghouses, and the federal E-Verify system. Please confirm that use of these data sources and record-retrieval vendors does not constitute prohibited subcontracting under I-16 and §7.F. (We note Appendix C #18 contemplates subcontractors.)

Response: No, it does not constitute prohibited subcontracting. However, the Offeror must store and present all findings/results on their own platform. The Authority does not want to access multiple systems for various results.

62. Question: Per RFP I-10, we request the following clarifications/relief: (a) If the Offeror owns no vehicles, will Hired and Non-Owned Auto coverage satisfy item 3? (b) Will the Authority accept Professional E&O and Cyber coverage written on a combined policy? (c) Will the Authority accept a certificate showing the Authority as Loss Payee on Crime coverage via endorsement at award rather than with the proposal?

Response: (a) Yes. (b) Yes, if the combined coverage level mirrors the individual levels required for Professional E&O and Cyber. (c) Yes.

63. Question: Consumer reporting agencies must retain certain records under the FCRA and applicable law. Please confirm that the Authority's ownership rights in §7.S–7.T apply to the Authority's copies of reports, and do not require the Offeror to deliver or destroy records it is legally required to retain.

Response: Pursuant to Section 1.A of the Sample Contract, Offeror is required to follow all applicable laws. In the event that Offeror is required to retain certain records pursuant to an applicable law, the Offeror shall notify the Authority of this and 7.S and 7.T shall apply to the Authority's copies of the reports.

64. Question: Is remote online notarization (RON) acceptable for the Affidavit of Non-Collusion, and are electronic signatures acceptable on all other signature pages (per II-6)?

Response: Electronic signatures are acceptable.

65. Question: Item 2 references both a 90-day and a "60-day period." Please confirm which period applies.

Response: See **CHANGES TO THE RFP DOCUMENT** above.

66. Question: Do sample reports, screenshots of the ordering platform, and integration documentation count toward the 10-page limit for Tab F, or may they be included in Tab K/Tab L?

Response: The documents can be included in Tab K and Tab L.

67. Question: Regarding Part IV-2, G. which Dayforce modules are in use (ATS, onboarding, core HR), and which integration methods (API, SFTP) are currently enabled for third-party vendors? Will the Authority provide an IT point of contact for implementation?

Response: The Authority has just implemented the HR Core and ATS modules. API will be used for integration, and the Authority will provide an IT contact during implementation.

68. Question: Please provide the estimated monthly volume of the 25-30 checks by service type (criminal, education, MVR, military, I-9, E-Verify) and the share requiring alias searches or multi-state searches.

Response: The 25-30 monthly estimate is not broken down by service, alias count, or multistate history in the supplied materials. I-9/E-Verify services are new to this engagement, and there is no historical data available.

69. Question: Is there an incumbent provider? If so, please provide the current pricing schedule, or current annual spend, for the same services.

Response: See response to Question 60.

70. Question: Please confirm whether all jurisdiction-specific and third-party fees (court, state repository, MVR, education institution fees) must be included in the itemized per-check prices, and whether the Authority will accept a stated assumption about jurisdiction mix or a defined process for searches in jurisdictions with unusually high fees.

Response: See response to Question 1. Any third-party fees included in the costs identified in sections A-C may not be charged outside of the package price identified on the Cost Form.

71. Question: The Cost Form requires pricing for Years 1 through 10. Are annual price escalators permitted, or must pricing be fixed for the full term?

Response: See response to Question 6 in Addendum #1.

72. Question: The Authority indicated on the pre-proposal call that I-9, military service verification, and E-Verify will be added to the Cost Form via addendum. Will these be priced as individual line items with per-check pricing, and will the "provided name" vs. "provided name and three aliases" structure apply to them?

Response: See response to Question 48.

73. Question: Work Statement IV-2 requires checks be performed within 24-48 hours and results available within 7 calendar days. When does the clock start (Authority request, applicant consent, or receipt of complete applicant information)? Are delays outside the Offeror's control, such as court closures or slow education institution responses, excluded?

Response: Checks must be initiated within 24-48 hours of receipt of complete applicant information. The selected Offeror must notify the Authority's project manager, via email, of any delays outside of the selected Offeror's control and provide an updated ETA.

74. Question: Please clarify whether the Authority is an existing E-Verify participant (MOU and employer account in place) or whether the Offeror is expected to enroll or act as a designated agent. Please also confirm whether the Offeror or the Authority completes Section 2 of the I-9, or whether the alternative remote examination procedure applies.

Response: The Authority is not an existing E-Verify participant. I-9/E-Verify services are new to the Authority, and the Authority will rely on the selected Offeror's guidance or industry best standard practices.

- 75. Question:** Proposal Form Section 2 refers to a contract delivered “within 90 days” and then to “that 60-day period.” Which period governs?

Response: See response to Question 65.

- 76. Question:** RFP Section I-7 and Part III-4(e) provide 10% weight for Small and Small Diverse Business participation. Is a self-certified SBPI certificate acceptable, and how are points assigned to Offerors that are not certified?

Response: Please refer to Part I-7 of the RFP document. No points are awarded to Offerors who do not provide their SBPI certificate or are not certified by PA DGS.

- 77. Question:** On the pre-proposal call, the Authority referred to “robust reporting.” Work Statement IV-2 only requires that results be delivered or exportable in report form. Please describe the reporting the Authority expects (for example, turnaround and volume dashboards, spend by service type, scheduled reports, audit logs, or data exports), and whether it must be available in the Offeror's platform, in Dayforce, or both.

Response: The reporting baseline must include searchable individual reports, order status, volumes, turnaround, charges, and exports, with I-9 completion and E-Verify status added for the new services. Vendor-platform reporting is acceptable as the principal reporting interface, provided required results and status updates integrate with Dayforce. Offerors should distinguish standard dashboards, scheduled reporting, audit logs, and custom reports, including any extra charges.

- 78. Question:** The Cost Form has a PATCH table for Pennsylvania but no line for other states' repository checks. How should the equivalent state repository search be priced for applicants who lived elsewhere, given that all fees must be included?

Response: See response to Question 1. These searches should not automatically replace the all-residence county component of the Industry Standard package.

- 79. Question:** Work Statement IV-2 requires criminal background check results within 7 calendar days. Pennsylvania State Police guidance for PATCH indicates that requests requiring manual review may take up to two weeks to resolve, regardless of the requestor's registration status. Does the Authority expect Offerors to guarantee the 7-day turnaround for PATCH results specifically, or does the Authority anticipate that state-repository turnaround may fall outside the standard SLA in some cases?

Response: See response to Question 55.

QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED IN ADDENDUM #3

- 1. Question:** Please confirm that the ownership provisions of Appendix B apply to Authority data and Authority-specific deliverables and do not transfer ownership of an Offeror's pre-existing or independently developed software, technology, platforms, APIs, methodologies, workflows, documentation, know-how, databases, or other intellectual property used to provide the Services.
- 2. Question:** Where should Offerors price any one-time setup/implementation or ongoing costs associated with the Dayforce/HRMS integration, if applicable? Will the Authority be responsible for any fees charged by Dayforce (e.g., marketplace/partner connector fees)?

END OF ADDENDUM TWO

Appendix A

Revised Insurance Requirements

THE PHILADELPHIA PARKING AUTHORITY
RFP NO. 26-17 BACKGROUND VERIFICATION SERVICES
ADDENDUM #2 – APPENDIX A
REVISED INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS

Prior to commencement of the contract and until completion of work, **Contractor** shall, at its sole expense, maintain the following insurance on its own behalf, with an insurance company or companies having an A.M. Best Rating of “A-: Class VII” or better, and furnish to The Philadelphia Parking Authority (PPA) Certificates of Insurance evidencing same. Coverage must be written on an “occurrence” basis (exception – professional and environmental/pollution liability may be written on a “claims-made basis) and shall be maintained without interruption through the entire period of this agreement.

1. Workers Compensation and Employers Liability: in the State in which the work is to be performed and elsewhere as may be required and shall include, where applicable, U.S. Longshoremen’s and Harbor Workers’ Coverage.
 - a) Workers’ Compensation Coverage: Statutory Requirements
 - b) Employers Liability Limits not less than:

Bodily Injury by Accident:	\$500,000 Each Accident
Bodily Injury by Disease:	\$500,000 Each Employee
Bodily Injury by Disease:	\$500,000 Policy Limit
2. Commercial General Liability: including Premises-Operations, Independent Contractors, Products/Completed Operation, Broad Form Property Damage, Contractual Liability (including Liability for Employee Injury assumed under a Contract), and Personal Injury Coverage.
 - a) Occurrence Form with the following limits:

(1) General Aggregate:	\$2,000,000
(2) Products/Completed Operations Aggregate:	\$1,000,000
(3) Each Occurrence:	\$1,000,000
(4) Personal and Advertising Injury:	\$1,000,000
(5) Fire Damage (any one fire):	\$ 50,000
(6) Medical Expense (any one person):	\$ 5,000
 - b) General Aggregate must apply on a Per Location Basis, as applicable.
 - c) Owner must be named as additional insured as shown in requirement #9.
3. Automobile Liability: (Note: if no owned vehicles, show at least hired and non-owned coverage)
 - a) Coverage to include:
 - (1) All Owned, Hired and Non-Owned Vehicles
 - (2) Contractual Liability Coverage (including Liability for Employee Injury assumed under a Contract)
 - b) Per Accident Combined Single Limit: \$500,000
 - c) Owner must be named as additional insured as shown in requirement #9.
4. Professional (E&O) Liability Insurance with minimum acceptable limits of \$1,000,000 per claim and aggregate. Claims-made is acceptable, but if coverage is canceled, non-renewed or discontinued, Contractor must purchase Extended Reporting Coverage for the applicable statute of repose. If the controlling legal jurisdiction does not have any applicable statute of repose, the Extended Reporting Coverage shall be maintained for the period of the applicable statute of limitations or for a period of seven (7) years, whichever duration is longest.
5. Cyber Liability Insurance with limits not less than \$1,000,000 per claim. If **Company** is providing services that provide or include direct access to Client’s information technology

THE PHILADELPHIA PARKING AUTHORITY
RFP NO. 26-17 BACKGROUND VERIFICATION SERVICES
ADDENDUM #2 – APPENDIX A
REVISED INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS

systems or holding sensitive information Client, then the above Technology Errors & Omissions insurance shall also include: Network Security/Privacy and Privacy Notification Costs (Cyber) Insurance: Coverage for loss, disclosure and theft of data in any form; media and content rights infringement and liability, including but not limited to, software, copyright infringement; network security failure, including but not limited to, denial of service attacks and transmission of malicious code. Coverage shall include data breach regulatory fines and penalties, the cost of notifying individuals of a security breach, the cost of credit monitoring services and any other causally-related crisis management expense for up to one (1) year. Coverage shall contain severability for the insured organization for any intentional act exclusions.

6. Crime Liability Insurance: with a minimum limit of \$1,000,000 per claim and aggregate. Coverage shall include Employee Theft of Client Property. The Authority shall be named as a Loss Payee.
7. Deductibles or Self-Insured Retentions: **Contractor** is responsible to pay all deductibles and/or self-insured retentions that may apply to the required insurance.
8. Financial Rating of Insurance Companies:
 - a) A.M. Best Rating: A – (Excellent) or Higher
 - b) A.M. Best Financial Size Category: Class VII or Higher
9. The Philadelphia Parking Authority, and its agents, employees, representatives, officers and directors individually and collectively, shall be added as ADDITIONAL INSURED on the policies as noted above. **Contractor's** coverage shall be primary and noncontributory to any other coverage available to the Philadelphia Parking Authority, including, without limitation, coverage maintained by the Philadelphia Parking Authority wherein the Philadelphia Parking Authority is named insured, and that no act of omission shall invalidate the coverage.
10. It is agreed that Company's insurance will not be cancelled, materially changed in a manner adverse to the Authority or non-renewed without at least thirty (30) days written notice to The Philadelphia Parking Authority, 701 Market Street, Suite 5400, Philadelphia, PA 19106, by Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested. Notice is not required where Company obtains replacement coverage at the levels identified herein, provided there is no lapse in coverage.
11. Waiver of Rights of Recovery and Waiver of Rights of Subrogation:
 - a) **Contractor** waives all rights of recovery against The Philadelphia Parking Authority and all additional Insureds for loss or damage covered by any of the insurance maintained by **Contractor** pursuant to this Contract.
 - b) **Contractor** and its respective insurance carriers hereby waive all rights of subrogation against The Philadelphia Parking Authority and all additional insureds for loss or damage covered by any of the insurance maintained by **Contractor** Pursuant to this contract.
 - c) If any of the policies of insurance required under this Contract require an endorsement to provide for the waiver of subrogation set forth in (b) above, then the named insureds of such policies will cause them to be endorsed.
12. The amount of insurance provided in the aforementioned insurance coverages, shall not be construed to be a limitation of the liability on the part of the **Contractor**.

THE PHILADELPHIA PARKING AUTHORITY
RFP NO. 26-17 BACKGROUND VERIFICATION SERVICES
ADDENDUM #2 – APPENDIX A
REVISED INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS

13. Any type of insurance or any increase in limits of liability not described above which the Authority requires for its own protection or on account of statue shall be its own responsibility and at its own expense.
14. The carrying of insurance shall in no way be interpreted as relieving **Contractor** of any responsibility or liability under the contract.
15. Prior to the commencement of work or use of premises, **Contractor** shall file Certificates of Insurance with The Philadelphia Parking Authority, which shall be subject to The Philadelphia Parking Authority's approval of adequacy of protection and the satisfactory character of the insurer. The Certificates of Insurance should be transmitted within five days of receipt of these insurance requirements to The Philadelphia Parking Authority, 701 Market Street, Suite 5400, Philadelphia, PA 19106, regardless of when your work will start. **Project description, Job Number, OR Contract Number must be shown on the Certificate of Insurance.**

In the event of a failure of **Contractor** to furnish and maintain said insurance and to furnish satisfactory evidence thereof, The Philadelphia Parking Authority shall have the right (but not the obligation) to take out and maintain the same for all parties on behalf of **Contractor** who agrees to furnish all necessary information thereof and to pay the cost thereof to The Philadelphia Parking Authority immediately upon presentation of an invoice.

16. Failure of **Contractor** to obtain and maintain the required insurance shall constitute a breach of contract and **Contractor** will be liable to the Philadelphia Parking Authority for any and all cost, liabilities, damages, and penalties (including attorney's fees, court, and settlement expenses) resulting from such breach, unless the Philadelphia Parking Authority provides **Contractor** with a written waiver of the specific insurance requirement.
17. None of the requirements contained herein as to the types, limits, or PPA's approval of insurance coverage to be maintained by **Contractor** are intended to and shall not in any manner, limit, qualify, or quantify the liabilities and obligations assumed by **Contractor** under the Contract Documents, any other agreement with the PPA, or otherwise provided by law.
18. If work involves subcontractors, **Contractor** shall require all subcontractors (of every tier) to meet the same insurance criteria as required of **Contractor**. The subcontractor's insurance must name the PPA as additional insured. **Contractor** shall maintain each subcontract's certificate of insurance on file and provide such information to the PPA for review upon request.
19. Failure of **Contractor** to provide insurance as herein required or failure of PPA to require evidence of insurance or to notify **Contractor** of any breach by **Contractor** of the requirements of this Section shall not be deemed to be a waiver of any of the terms of the Contract Documents, nor shall they be deemed to be a waiver of the obligation of **Contractor** to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the indemnified parties as required herein. The obligation to procure and maintain any insurance required is a separate responsibility of **Contractor** and independent of the duty to furnish a copy or certificate of such insurance policies.