

## **ADDENDUM No. 1**

### **RFP No. 26-01**

#### **Sustainable Energy Utility Billing and Customer Relation Management Software**

**Updated Due Date: January 12<sup>th</sup>, 2026 by 2:00 P.M. (local time)**

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original documents and all previous addenda (if any) and is appended thereto. **This Addendum includes fourteen (14) pages.**

**The Proposer is to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1, including all attachments in its Proposal by so indicating in the proposal that the addendum has been received. Proposals submitted without acknowledgement of receipt of this addendum may be considered non-conforming.**

**The following forms provided within the RFP Document should be included in submitted proposal:**

- **Attachment B – City of Ann Arbor Non-Discrimination Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment C - City of Ann Arbor Living Wage Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment D - Vendor Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form of the RFP Document**

**Proposals that fail to provide these completed forms listed above upon proposal opening may be rejected as non-responsive and may not be considered for award.**

#### **I. CORRECTIONS/ADDITIONS/DELETIONS**

Changes to the RFP documents which are outlined below are referenced to a page or Section in which they appear conspicuously. Offerors are to take note in its review of the documents and include these changes as they may affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

<b>Section/Page(s)</b>	<b>Change</b>
------------------------	---------------

All mentions	As provided in RFP No. 26-01 Document: Proposal Due Date: January 7, 2026 by 2:00 p.m. (local time)  As updated herein: Proposal Due Date: January 12, 2026 by 2:00 p.m. (local time)
--------------	---

*Comment: The Due Date and Time for responses to this RFP has been extended to January 12, 2026 by 2:00 p.m. (local time). Note that all other dates are unchanged.*

(This Space Intentionally Left Blank)

## **II. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

The following Questions have been received by the City. Responses are being provided in accordance with the terms of the RFP. Respondents are directed to take note in its review of the documents of the following Questions and City responses as they affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

### **Questions Regarding Rules and Protocol**

Question 1: Is there an option to submit the proposal via email? To support sustainability goals and prevent delivery issues, would the City consider accepting proposals by email and waiving the need for mailed hard copies/USB?

Answer 1: The requirement for hard copies is not flexible and cannot be waived.

Question 2: Would the City consider granting a one-week extension following the holidays to allow vendors the opportunity to submit their best responses and to help ensure successful delivery in the event of potential weather-related delays?

Answer 2: We will extend the due date to Monday, January 12th.

Question 3: Please confirm whether a communication blackout period applies after the December 9, 2025 Question deadline.

Answer 3: If there are additional Questions submitted after this Addenda is published, there is no guarantee a new Addenda will be published prior to the submittal deadline.

Question 4: Should all communications—including technical clarification—be routed exclusively through the two named contacts (Scope: Anna Oostendorp; Process: Colin Spencer)?

Answer 4: Yes

Question 5: Will the City issue a consolidated answers addendum on or before December 16, 2025, or multiple rolling addenda?

Answer 5: This is a single consolidated addenda.

Question 6: Has SEU reviewed any CRM platforms in the past 12 months? If so, could you share product names and learning outcomes from those sessions to ensure we align with expectations?

Answer 6: The only platform that SEU has considered prior to this RFP is Cogsdale, which is the current platform in use by the City for water billing. The SEU is interested in exploring other options in addition to Cogsdale.

Question 7: Could you please provide the names of all bidders? Has the City been in contact with other vendors before the release of this RFP? If so, please list.

Answer 7: The City of Ann Arbor sends out notices of all RFPs through MITN/Bid Net in addition to sharing information with individual companies who may be interested. All told, over 1445 companies were notified of this RFP. Once proposals are received, we would be willing to share the list of companies who submitted with anyone who inquires.

### **Questions Regarding Contractual, Legal, Insurance & Compliance**

Question 8: The City states the Professional Services Agreement is non-negotiable. Can the City confirm if any clauses may be annotated or clarified (but not changed)?

Answer 8: The Professional Services Agreement included in the RFP is a sample. The selected vendor may provide their standard agreement for review and markup by the City of Ann Arbor legal department, or the vendor and the City may work

together to use the City's sample to create the agreement. Once signed, it may not be revised without separate signed addenda.

Question 9: Insurance: Can the City clarify whether only the vendor must hold \$5M cyber liability, or also any sub-vendors?

Answer 9: Any vendors that require a signed contract or separate invoices or purchase orders with City of Ann Arbor must abide by our insurance requirements. The Merchant Processor has separate insurance requirements which are listed within the RFP.

Question 10: Does the City require an annual re-attestation for myCOI compliance?

Answer 10: Yes, the Certificate of Insurance must be resubmitted and reviewed annually. A contact at the selected company will be set up with an account to receive notifications from myCOI regarding annual reminders and status.

Question 11: Does Ann Arbor have a Master Services Agreement or similar for any cloud services provider such as AWS, Microsoft, or other platform?

Answer 11: City of Ann Arbor uses Microsoft as our enterprise cloud service.

### **Questions Regarding Project Schedule and Budget**

Question 12: Regarding Item 5 and Page 11: *The SEU plans to implement services and the associated billing system in phases, beginning with a straightforward launch in 2026 and expanding its complexity and capabilities in subsequent phases. The desired solution should provide flexibility for a rapid and cost-effective initial rollout while supporting future growth and enhancement. Phase 1, scheduled for 2026, is expected to include billing for solar and energy storage services, using either flat rates based on system size or variable per-kWh charges (without tiers, time-of-use rates, or other complex structures). District geothermal billing is expected to be added by 2028, with additional products – such as on-bill financing and more complex rate designs – introduced over time.* Could you provide additional detail around the phased rollout? We see "...scheduled for 2026..." however that is a large window for Phase 1 to pass through the software development lifecycle to Go Live.

Answer 12: The City hopes to be able to Go Live in fall 2026 (exact timing TBD in collaboration with the solution provider) with the simple "phase 1" requirements described above (solar and energy storage services only, with a simple rate structure), for a group of ~100-500 pilot customers

Question 13: What is the estimated budget range for the project's implementation and ongoing annual costs? Has a budget range been identified for the current project - Implementation cost, Annual cost, and number of years? If so, is it possible to share?

Answer 13: The SEU will not be providing the budget range prior to reviewing submittals to this RFP. However, respondents should note that the SEU is a start-up within the City and has committed to offering affordable energy to its customers, so a cost-conscious solution is important.

Question 14: Is this project funded under a grant, bonds, or revenues? If a grant, can you describe the grant, its term, and anticipated use (labor, this RFP, etc)?

Answer 14: The City has grant funding that will support the initial implementation, and longer term the SEU will be revenue-funded.

Question 15: We see dates out to 2028 for phased rollout - Is there funding in place for the approximately two year Discovery through latter Phase "Go Live"? If not, what funding exists?

Answer 15: The SEU is confident in its ability to raise funding beyond the resources currently

in hand to enable continued investment in billing software through 2028 and beyond.

### **Questions Regarding Project Scope**

Question 16: What billing/CIS system is the City currently using for utility services, and who is the vendor supporting it? What CIS & Billing system does the City of Ann Arbor use today for the other utility services, e.g., electric, water, gas, trash? Does the SEU intend to integrate with it or transition away from it?

Answer 16: The City is currently utilizing Cogsdale for Water Billing. If the SEU selects a separate system, we do not intend for the separate system to integrate with Cogsdale. We are not currently planning to transition away from Cogsdale (see q.17)

Question 17: Is the City considering using their existing CIS & Billing system for the SEU billing? If not, why is that?

Answer 17: The SEU has not ruled out using the existing system for SEU billing.

Question 18: What are the key challenges or pain points the City is experiencing with the existing system? Can you provide additional details regarding the key problems or limitations in the current system that cannot be addressed through incremental updates?

Answer 18: This RFP is not issued in response to challenges or pain points associated with the existing billing system.

Question 19: Since the City is standing up a new electric utility, will the scope of this project also include migrating the existing water utility onto the new billing platform, or is the water service expected to remain on the legacy system for now? If not, are there any plans to add the water utility to the new platform in the future?

Answer 19: There are not any current plans to add the water utility to the new platform but we would like to ensure that whatever platform is selected can accommodate that option in the future if that is ever desired.

Question 20: Are there any customer classes beyond residential, commercial, municipal, and institutional that we should account for?

Answer 20: The SEU anticipates having various pilot rates, that could be accommodated via additional customer classes or sub-classes, or via riders or other mechanisms within an existing rate class.

Question 21: Will customers require multiple login roles (e.g., landlords, property managers, installers)?

Answer 21: We anticipate a single standard view upon login for the customer portal. If the solution has additional functionality they would like to demonstrate (for example, tenants versus owners) we would be interested in seeing that functionality.

Question 22: Is multilingual support required beyond ADA compliance?

Answer 22: Yes, we would like the online customer portal to be translatable to other languages, either via compatibility with browser language settings or as a feature of the software.

Question 23: Are SMS notifications provided through a City-approved vendor, or should the selected vendor supply this service?

Answer 23: The vendor should supply this service. This would be an optional feature.

Question 24: What IVR system is currently in use?

Answer 24: We do not have a city-wide IVR system in use. Any of our applications that send

SMS notifications are managed by those applications.

Question 25: Who is currently providing lockbox services for the City?

Answer 25: JPMorgan.

Question 26: Is a mobile application (Android and iPhone) included in the project scope? Would a responsive web and mobile portal fully meet the requirements, or does SEU also foresee a native mobile app in future phases?

Answer 26: A mobile application is not a requirement of the project but if the vendor has an application we are open to viewing it as part of the demonstration. Please itemize it as a separate line item in the fee proposal. Mobile optimization is a requirement of the website.

Question 27: To support business rules that reduce human error in manual workflows, could you please share examples of the operations in which manual input is expected?

Answer 27: Examples of manual input in the system could include entering a new account's contact information or updating existing accounts (including email and phone), or making a bill correction or adjustment (overriding amount, processing refunds) . Business rules that check for key criteria (correct number of digits and data type and length, for example) may help reduce manual entry errors.

Question 28: Regarding pages 3 and 11: *It should also provide user-friendly tools for internal staff and an intuitive, accessible interface and experience for end-use customers.*

*"...grow over time to serve up to several hundred MW of demand and tens of thousands of customers."* Is it an accurate assumption that this requirement will be satisfied via a public portal? If so, do you expect each customer unit to have a unique username/password combination (secure login)? What sort of functions would you like the customer base to be able to perform via this portal (citizen self-service)?

Answer 28: User-friendly tools for internal staff should exist within the staff software. Staff would not be logging into the customer portal. Customers and staff alike need the ability to view historic bills, payments, and usage for a property, view and manage payments and payment plans, and view trends and predictions for upcoming bills. Customers will need unique login credentials, whether that is email or username based.

### **Questions Regarding Volumes & Sizing**

Question 29: Can the City provide estimated initial customer count for 2026 (20 MW scale)

Answer 29: The SEU expects 100-500 customers in 2026:

Question 30: How many active SEU accounts are expected in the first 12 months? Within 2-3 years? What is the projected customer growth rate for scalability planning? Can the City provide expected ramp-up curve to tens of thousands of customers?

Answer 30: The SEU expects 100-500 accounts in the first 12 months, growing to several thousand within 2-3 years.

Question 31: What are the expected Monthly Billing Volumes?

Answer 31: Unknown, see answers 29 and 30

Question 32: What are the expected Annual print/mail volumes?

Answer 32: Unknown, see answers 29 and 30

Question 33: What is the expected portal adoption rate? How many customers are expected to use the CRM (Customer Portal)?

Answer 33: All customers will be encouraged to use the online portal.

Question 34: How many active utility accounts are there [in the current billing system]?  
Answer 34: The SEU has no customers today and is not currently using a billing system.

Question 35: What is the current number of residential, industrial, and commercial accounts?  
Answer 35: See answer 34: We are unable to predict how many of each customer class will opt into the SEU.

Question 36: Can we receive some details regarding monthly transaction volumes with customer meters, volume of outbound correspondence, and reports run by staff?  
Answer 36: See Answers 29-32, as all transaction volumes will correlate to the number of customers at that time. We cannot predict outbound correspondence and staff reporting needs at this time.

### **Questions Regarding Staff and Training**

Question 37: How many City staff will require system access? Which internal SEU teams will be using the system (billing, customer service, engineering, field service, IT, etc.)? What are their titles and basic roles?

Answer 37: We estimate 3-10 City Staff will need access to the system across billing, customer service, IT, and leadership roles within the first few years of use.

Question 38: How many staff will need a supervisory dashboard view over a group of persons?  
Answer 38: Likely 2-5 of the staff users will be in supervisory or leadership roles.

Question 39: Will each staff member need a username/password combination to access the system?  
Answer 39: Yes, with a preference for SSO integration with our Active Directory.

Question 40: Are there Board level or similarly situated persons who need access to a custom dashboard just for that level stakeholder?  
Answer 40: No

Question 41: Does the City prefer onsite, virtual, or blended training sessions? Could you elaborate on your preferences or requirements regarding training delivery formats (in-person, virtual, or hybrid)? Are there any constraints related to session length or specific training schedules? How many City staff members will require hands-on training?

Answer 41: We would like to plan for fully virtual training sessions up front, with the ability to purchase onsite training sessions if necessary during the implementation process.

### **Questions Regarding Billing Processes**

Question 42: How many billing cycles does the City currently operate? Does the City perform any quarterly, semi-annual, or annual billing in addition to regular billing cycles?  
Answer 42: The SEU anticipates billing on a monthly or quarterly cycle.

Question 43: Could you please share the current rate table?  
Answer 43: The SEU's rates are under development.

Question 44: Should the system support off-cycle billing and mid-cycle recalculations?  
Answer 44: Not required.

- Question 45: Could you provide a sample bill, delinquent notice, and bill insert?  
Answer 45: The SEU has not yet developed these templates.
- Question 46: Who is currently providing bill printing and mailing services for the City? Is the City open to changing the bill printing and mailing services provider?  
Answer 46: The city currently uses Peregrine Solutions. The SEU is open to using a different provider.
- Question 47: For Phase I, which solar and battery storage billing models will be used (e.g., flat, per-kWh, hybrid)?  
Answer 47: See answer 43
- Question 48: For geothermal billing expected in 2028, what metering hardware and rate structures are anticipated?  
Answer 48: See answer 43 regarding rates. For metering hardware, we have not determined the metering hardware yet.
- Question 49: Will SEU require consolidated billing for multiple services under a single account?  
Answer 49: Yes.
- Question 50: Which low-income discount programs need to be configured in the system?  
Answer 50: See answer 43:
- Question 51: Should late fees vary by service type or customer group?  
Answer 51: See answer 43:
- Question 52: What storage retention is required for bills, notices, meter reads, CRM interactions, backups, logs (years)?  
Answer 52: The SEU has not finalized its document retention schedules but anticipates needing multi-year storage.

### **Questions Regarding Payment Processing**

- Question 53: Why does the City have multiple merchant processors, i.e., Invoice Cloud, Tyler Payments, Forte, USAEpay/MyGovPay? Could you clarify the primary operational or technical drivers behind this approach and whether SEU has a preferred partner for consolidation?  
Answer 53: Many of our applications have a short list of payment processors they are compatible with. Over the years, this has resulted in multiple payment processors in use across the City. At this point, priority is given to payment processors with whom we have pre-existing agreements.
- Question 54: The City prefers existing processors (InvoiceCloud → Tyler Payments → Forte → USAEpay). Should vendors propose an alternative only if native integration with these is missing?  
Answer 54: Yes.
- Question 55: Must the system support: Daily posting? Real-time Posting? AutoPay with tokenization?  
Answer 55: Daily posting with the bank. Real-time reflection of payments between the merchant processor and billing system. Autopay is a desired functionality.
- Question 56: What are the exact ACH/NSF/chargeback workflows required?  
Answer 56: ACH payments should function the same way as credit card payments, reflecting in real-time on the invoice and sending a receipt to the customer. If an ACH

payment bounces back as NSF the invoice needs to also flip back to a status of payment due, and the customer needs to receive an alert that their payment was not processed and is still outstanding. The integration with New World Services needs to reflect ACH payments as revenue the same day they are processed, and reflect the loss of NSF revenue to that GL account. Staff need to be alerted to chargebacks so they can dispute if applicable and review if it was a duplicate charge on a single invoice. If the chargeback is granted, the integration with New World Services needs to reflect the loss of revenue to that GL account. Staff need a means of flagging an invoice as unpaid if the chargeback is granted; whether this is done automatically by the payment processor or manually by staff at the time the chargeback is lost.

Question 57: Will the City provide channel-level payment volumes for sizing?

Answer 57: We are unable to provide payment volumes until we begin collecting payments. We intend to collect payments via online, mail, and phone.

Question 58: Does the City require “fee pass-through toggle” control at the rate level or globally?

Answer 58: This just needs to be a global level option.

Question 59: What is the frequency of bank reconciliation expected (daily, intra-day)?

Answer 59: Daily

Question 60: Must the system provide settlement-level reconciliation files for NWS?

Answer 60: Yes, we will need to automate a daily xml or csv report from the billing system that reflects all payments received by GL account; which could then be imported into NWS and compared to the settlement received for the same day in the bank.

Question 61: Will the City continue to apply late fees, write-offs, and tax-roll transfers in the new system or externally?

Answer 61: These are all features we are requesting within the new system. Regarding tax roll transfers, the actual processing to tax roll takes place in our financial system but the need to flag invoices as transferred to tax roll is necessary within the billing system.

### **Questions Regarding Data Migration and Management**

Question 62: Can SEU provide further details on their existing system's technology stack and specific data formats to offer you the best choice of cloud platform and to facilitate data migration planning?

Answer 62: The SEU is not migrating any existing data at this time, we are looking to begin a new utility from scratch.

Question 63: Please confirm all source systems feeding initial migration (e.g., Aclara, NWS Financials, Cityworks, ArcGIS).

Answer 63: See answer 62

Question 64: Will the City provide data dictionaries and sample extracts from each system?

Answer 64: See answer 62

Question 65: Which legacy systems will be retired vs. Retained?

Answer 65: See answer 62

Question 66: How many years of history must be migrated for Billing, Payments, Meter reads, Adjustments, Communications

Answer 66: See answer 62



- Question 67: Are there regulatory requirements specific to Michigan energy utilities that influence retention?  
Answer 67: See answers 52 and 62
- Question 68: Will the SEU require migration of interval data?  
Answer 68: See answer 62
- Question 69: What meter types and read intervals are expected (15/60-minute)?  
Answer 69: We have not determined if we will be metering and if so what meter intervals will be used.
- Question 70: Will interval data for solar generation and storage be included?  
Answer 70: See answer 62
- Question 71: Who is responsible for data cleansing?  
Answer 71: See answer 62
- Question 72: What quality thresholds must be met (e.g., > 0.5% duplicate accounts)?  
Answer 72: See answer 62
- Question 73: What are the City's expectations for test migrations (cycles, volumes)?  
Answer 73: See answer 62
- Question 74: How many years of historical data need to be migrated into the new system?  
Answer 74: See answer 62

### **Questions Regarding Environment Structure**

- Question 75: What minimum environments are required (e.g., DEV, TEST, UAT, PRE-PROD, PROD)?  
Answer 75: Test and Prod are preferable, but we're open to discussion
- Question 76: How frequently should lower environments be refreshed from PROD?  
Answer 76: By request is usually sufficient, but weekly or monthly would be ideal
- Question 77: Are anonymized data requirements imposed for non-prod environments?  
Answer 77: No, it should be a copy

### **Questions Regarding GIS Integration**

- Question 78: What specific modules (GL, AR, AP) are to be integrated? Which modules of New World Systems will require real-time integration versus batch integration?  
Answer 78: We anticipate the following integration needs with New World Systems: A real time integration for all utility payments that flows between NWS and Cogsale. A Utility Refund AP import file that gets send to NWS daily, along with 2 Utility Journal Import files for movement of cash/etc.
- Question 79: What file formats/interfaces are required for the New World Systems integration?  
Answer 79: NWS accepts XML or CSV and we can provide the interface templates for both.
- Question 80: Must the solution support Parcel ID as the authoritative key across premises?  
Answer 80: We're open to alternative keys, as Parcel ID can at times encompass multiple addresses. Parcel ID must be a reference on the account.

Question 81: Is bi-directional GIS sync required or view-only map layers?

Answer 81: Bi-directional should be used for the system to write/draw customer properties/assets to a map layer.

Question 82: Will SEU need map, heat map, or similar graphical reporting?

Answer 82: We're open to seeing what reporting is available by the vendors

### **Questions Regarding CityWorks Integration**

Question 83: Which Cityworks objects require bidirectional synchronization (e.g., work orders, assets, service history)?

Answer 83: None. Any GIS feature (asset) integrations would be sent to GIS first then consumed by Cityworks.

Question 84: Which Cityworks events must trigger updates (start/stop service, work orders, meter swaps, etc.)?

Answer 84: This will depend on the workflows we develop but it is critical that this system has a ROBUST API AND PREFERABLY WITH WEBHOOK CAPABILITIES.

Question 85: Regarding the Cityworks integration, is mobile offline workflow support required?

Answer 85: No, Cityworks mobile is offline but syncs with our database. Any integrations would run at that point.

### **Questions Regarding Meter Data Integration**

Question 86: Regarding Meter Data integration, What VEE rules must be replicated?

Answer 86: The SEU has not determined if it will be metering in phase 1 (solar and storage), but if it does, it will be generation-only meters with yet-to-be-determined VEE rules.

Question 87: Regarding Meter Data integration, What are expected error-handling queues and SLA requirements?

Answer 87: See answers 92 – 96.

Question 88: Will the Aclara AMI data and meter asset data both be synchronized with Cityworks, or will CRM be considered the system of record for meter-to-customer relationship?

Answer 88: The billing/CRM system should be the system of record for meter-to-customer relationships.

### **Questions Regarding Integrations in General**

Question 89: Regarding Integrations in general, does the City prefer real-time API events, nightly batch SFTP, webhooks, message bus?

Answer 89: We often prefer real-time API events, but we're open to discussing alternatives and have many integrations utilizing different methods.

Question 90: Are there security requirements for API gateway, throttling, retries, audit logs?

Answer 90: See the security requirements in the RFP. Note that throttling to protect from abuse and DoS, and audit log retention of 1 year is preferred.

Question 91: Regarding Item 31: The system must provide an API or direct database access to enable integration with the City's business intelligence and reporting platforms. Could you provide additional detail regarding these referenced systems?

Answer 91: We use Apache Superset and MS SQL Server databases to store information.

## **Questions Regarding Performance and SLAs**

Question 92: What are expected SLAs for: System uptime

Answer 92: We expect a system uptime SLA of 99:9% or higher, measured monthly, excluding scheduled maintenance windows. Uptime includes all core CRM functionality, customer portals, and APIs. Credits or penalties apply if uptime falls below the SLA threshold.

Question 93: What are expected SLAs for: Batch billing window

Answer 93: Batch billing and other scheduled jobs will execute within a 1 hour nightly window, typically between 12:00 AM–1:00 AM local time.

Question 94: What are expected SLAs for: Peak concurrency (staff portal + customer portal)?

Answer 94: Staff portal: 10-50 concurrent authenticated users (scalable); Customer portal: 200–20,000 concurrent users (scalable with cloud auto-scaling)

Question 95: Are maintenance windows predetermined (City standard) or negotiated?

Answer 95: We anticipate that the vendor will schedule maintenance at pre-determined times based on region and time zone. We expect that these would be scheduled for lowest possible traffic time periods such as weekend overnight windows. If any vendor does not conduct maintenance during these windows we would ask for an explanation regarding their windows.

Question 96: What advance-notice period is required for maintenance?

Answer 96: Planned maintenance: 5–14 days; Major upgrades / disruptive maintenance: 30 days; Emergency maintenance: best effort, often 24 hours or immediate notice

## **Questions Regarding Disaster Recovery and Operations**

Question 97: The RFP states  $RTO \leq 24$  hrs and  $RPO \leq 4$  hrs. Does the City require evidence of DR test results? And what frequency of DR testing is required?

Answer 97: Yes, we require evidence of DR test results. DR testing is required annually.

Question 98: What is the SLA penalty structure for missed RPO/RTO or support response times?

Answer 98: We would like our agreement to include service credits issued based on severity of the ticket or delay of the RPO/RTO.

Question 99: Is the DR site required to be U.S.-only as well?

Answer 99: Yes

Question 100: What are expectations for Log retention/forwarding

Answer 100: Annual preferred

Question 101: What are expectations for: SIEM integration

Answer 101: Preferred

Question 102: What are expectations for Real-time alerts

Answer 102: Preferred

Question 103: What are expectations for Audit trail access (export? API?)

Answer 103: Ability to get audit trail is necessary. Export is sufficient.

## **Questions Regarding Security, Data Sovereignty and Compliance**

Question 104: Requirement 42 mandates all data stay in the U.S.—does this include Backups; DR Sites; Support personell accessing data?

Answer 104: Backups: Yes; DR Sites: Yes; Support personnel accessing data: No

Question 105: Is AES-256 at rest and TLS 1:2+ sufficient, or is FIPS 140-2 validated encryption required?

Answer 105: AES-256/TLS 1:2+ sufficient

Question 106: Does the City require vendor-managed keys, customer-managed keys, or either?

Answer 106: Vendor managed preferred

Question 107: Does the City require SOC 2 Type II annually?

Answer 107: No

Question 108: Does the City require PCI DSS AoC annually?

Answer 108: Yes

Question 109: Will the City conduct its own security review or penetration test of the hosted environment?

Answer 109: No

Question 110: Are audit responses required within a defined SLA?

Answer 110: We are open to the vendor's standard process.

Question 111: For Microsoft Entra SSO, does the City require SAML 2:0 or OAuth/OIDC?

Answer 111: Either are acceptable

Question 112: What MFA method does the City mandate for staff and for customer portal?

Answer 112: Duo is our current MFA provider

Question 113: What is the frequency of privileged access reviews ?

Answer 113: Annually

Question 114: What is the required format for full data export at contract end?

Answer 114: Excel exports of all database tables in addition to all stored files.

Question 115: What is the breach-notification requirement (hours)?

Answer 115: 72 hours

Question 116: Is offshore work allowed, noting that no SEU data can ever leave the United States? If so, can offshore work include coding/configuring the system assuming that synthetic (anonymized or computer generated) test data is used by offshore staff? If not, can roles that do not touch data, such as development of the user interface be performed by offshore team members ?

Answer 116: Those solutions should be acceptable. Personal Identifiable Information (PII) for our customers is what must remain in the United States.

## **Questions Regarding Evaluation Method**

Question 117: Section III references a weighted scoring method—can the City confirm exact point allocations for Functional, Technical, Support, Security/Compliance, and Price categories?

Answer 117: The weighting scale is broken down as follows: Professional Qualifications = 15 points; Past Involvement with Similar Projects = 25 points; Outline of Requirements and Proposed Work Plan = 30 points; Fee Proposal = 30 points. The functional, technical, support, and security/compliance items will all be scored within the Outline of Requirements and Proposed Work Plan category. The price will be scored under the Fee Proposal category.

Question 118: Will the City require: Scripted demonstrations? Sandbox access? Hands-on system testing? Reference checks? Finalist interviews (week of Jan 26, 2026)?

Answer 118: Scripted demonstrations and reference checks are expected. Hands-on system testing of a sandbox environment would be appreciated. Finalist interviews are to be determined depending on how the first round of interviews/demos go.

Question 119: How will these activities factor into the score (e.g., rescoring after demo, weighting adjustments)?

Answer 119: The weighted score will be used to determine which proposals will be invited to the first round of demonstrations and interviews. Once demonstrations are held, the evaluation committee members will apply additional scores and overall grades to every vendor.

### **Questions Regarding Implementation, Project Governance, & Staffing**

Question 120: Does the City require a single-phase or multi-phase implementation aligned to: 2026 solar + storage, 2028 geothermal, later on-bill financing?

Answer 120: As the SEU is a start-up and launching services in phases, key business decisions about phase 2 (geothermal) and on-bill financing and potential future add-ons, including metering and rates for these offerings, may not be made at the time of phase 1 implementation in 2026. As such we anticipate a phase 1 implementation in 2026 followed by later add-ons, but we need to know up front that the system will have all capabilities necessary for the later phase additions.

Question 121: What change-management deliverables are required (training plans, user adoption, comms)?

Answer 121: We only need a training plan.

Question 122: How many City staff will participate in UAT?

Answer 122: No more than 10.

Question 123: What is the expected hypercare duration after September 2026 go-live?

Answer 123: At least 3 months.

Question 124: Does the City require onsite presence for: Requirements, Training, Cutover, Go-live support?

Answer 124: Not anticipated. If on-site visits are determined to be needed we are open to purchasing that as an add-on as needed.

Question 125: Could you specify your expectations regarding post-implementation support, including desired help desk availability, expected response and resolution times, and the type of support services required? What sort of term (length) is Ann Arbor seeking for the ongoing customer support services?

Answer 125: After implementation, it is expected that standard support is continued for the entire duration of our use of the system – this includes regularly scheduled check-ins with an account rep and ongoing as needed help desk support. Expected response times for help tickets should fall within 48 hours (24 hours for urgent tickets) and expected resolution times within 1 week. Additional support services required are listed under “Ongoing Customer Support” (items 36-39) on the RFP.

Offerors are responsible for any conclusions that they may draw from the information contained in the Addendum.