POLICE DEPARTMENT
Contract Administration Section
375 Pearl Street, 15th Floor, Room 15-207
New York, NY 10038

Date: November 13, 2026

To: Potential Bidders

From: Jordan Glickstein, Agency Chief Contracting Officer

RE: Addendum #4 for Paid Detail RFP, E-PIN# - 05626P0001

This Addendum #4 is issued to extend the proposal due date and final question deadline, make a revision to the RFP's language, release materials from the Pre-Proposal Conference, release an additional solicitation document, release the Schedule A for Clients, update the Schedule A for Vendors which was previously published in Addendum #1, and respond to Vendor questions. The Schedule A for Vendors attached to this Addendum #4 supplants the version released in Addendum #1. To the extent that there are any discrepancies, the information/ answers contained in this addendum shall supersede and take precedence over the information contained in the original solicitation document.

I. EXTENSION TO THE PROPOSAL DUE DATE TO TUESDAY, DECEMBER 22, 2026 at 4:00PM:

Due to the high volume of Vendor questions received, the proposal due date has been postponed four times since the release of this RFP. Addendum #1 extended the Proposal due date to September 30, 2026, Addendum #2 extended it to Thursday, November 12, 2026, and Addendum #3 extended the deadline to December 3, 2026. **This Addendum #4 extends the current proposal due date to Tuesday, December 22, 2026 at 4:00 PM.**

II. LANGUAGE CHANGE TO THE RFP:

Section VIII of the RFP states, "The Platforms must include functionality to verify a UMOS's attendance electronically via a mobile device. The Contractor shall design and implement secure digital attendance verification features that comply with NYPD policies and incorporate necessary business rules and security protocols." This language in the RFP is now being replaced with the following language: "**The Vendor shall implement an industry-standard secure electronic interface through which its platform automatically receives in real-time the attendance record transmitted by the Department-designated application for each present-for-duty and off-duty event. The interface shall comply with applicable NYPD policies, business rules, technical requirements, and modernized security protocols. The Vendor's Platform shall maintain an audit trail of each attendance record received, and each change/correction applied. The audit trail shall preserve the original and corrected versions and the date and**

time of each change. The Vendor shall implement controls to detect and reconcile missing or duplicate attendance records and to identify and resolve failed transmissions.

The Vendor is responsible for creating a schema and data formats as requested by NYPD detailing paid detail assignments with all relevant information for ingestion into the Department's environment. The data update cadence will be determined upon implementation.

The Vendor shall continuously monitor the availability, connectivity, and successful receipt of attendance records from the Department-designated application. The Vendor shall implement automated controls to promptly detect connectivity failures, transmission interruptions, or delays in receiving expected attendance records. Upon detecting an issue, the Vendor shall immediately investigate and validate its platform, infrastructure, and network connectivity to identify and resolve any issues within its environment. The Vendor shall promptly notify the Department of any service disruption, provide relevant diagnostic information, and coordinate with Department technical personnel as necessary to restore connectivity. The Vendor shall be responsible for ensuring that any attendance records delayed or missed during an interruption are subsequently received, reconciled, and accurately processed without duplication."

III. PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE MATERIALS:

Please see the attached PowerPoint slides and attendance sheet from the Pre-Proposal Conference. All questions answered during the conference are recorded within Section VII of this Addendum #4 titled, "Questions Received from Vendors", sorted by topic.

IV. ADDITIONAL SOLICITATION DOCUMENT TO BE SUBMITTED:

As referenced in the RFP, Proposers must complete the Doing Business Data Form in order to comply with Local Law 34. This form was not originally included in the Documents tab of the RFx in PASSPort; however, it is now available there as well as attached to this Addendum #4. Please include the completed form in the Document Submission section of the PASSPort RFx along with your proposal.

V. SCHEDULE A FOR CLIENTS

A number of questions ask the minimum insurance limits used to determine Client eligibility. Therefore, attached to this Addendum #4 is the specific Schedule A for Clients requiring that they have Commercial General Liability policy valued at no less than $1 million per occurrence and $2 million in the aggregate.

VI. UPDATE TO SCHEDULE A FOR VENDORS

The Schedule A for Vendors has been updated to align with the NYPD Cloud Rider. The minimum insurance limit for Cyber Liability was previously $1 million. The minimum limit has now been updated to no less than $10 million per occurrence and $20 million in aggregate.

VII. QUESTIONS RECEIVED FROM VENDORS:

a. PROCUREMENT DETAILS AND TIMELINE

Question 1:

Can you share the technical document? I thought there was a technical questionnaire which looks different than the list of documents in the RFP.

Answer 1:

The specifications/scope of work containing all the requirements for the new Paid Detail Platform are set forth in the RFP – Paid Detail System. The RFP document is one of the documents that is uploaded and available for all prospective Proposers to view in the Document Section in PASSPort for this solicitation. There is also a Technical Qualifications Section within the Questionnaire in PASSPort that sets forth the requirements/expectations for each of the four (4) Sections of the Technical Proposal that must be submitted by each Proposer and on which each responding Proposer will be given a technical score.

Question 2:

Is there a specific time deadline on the 22nd for questions?

Answer 2:

The question deadline was 11:59 PM on July 22nd.

Question 3:

Are there any attachments or supplemental documents beyond the PASSPort listing we should review before submitting our response?

Answer 3:

The NYPD has released three addenda (Addenda #1, #2, and #3) to extend the Proposal due date and release the Schedule A for Vendors (attached to the Addendum #1 and updated via this Addendum #4). This Addendum #4 responds to Vendor questions and publishes additional solicitation documents, referenced above, to review before Proposal submission. Including those addenda and any attachments, which are posted in the Documents section of PASSPort, there are no other outside documents to review.

Question 4:

Where I can Obtain the complete solicitation documents, including all addenda and technical requirements.

Answer 4:

All solicitation materials are posted within the PASSPort RFx under the EPIN, 05626P0001.

Question 5:

Whether there are any additional steps we should complete in PASSPort before submitting a proposal.

Answer 5:

All prospective Proposers must be fully filed in PASSPort in order to be considered for award.

Question 6:

Whether there is a procurement representative or technical representative I should speak with regarding questions about the requirements

Answer 6:

All questions relating to this procurement should be directed to tiana.urey@nypd.org and jordan.glickstein@nypd.org.

Question 7:

Also, where can we find the Doing Business Data Form / Information referenced within the RFP? It is not listed amongst the RFP document links and I want to be sure to include this required form within our response.

Answer 7:

Please see the Doing Business Data Form attached to this Addendum #4. The Doing Business Data Form was not initially included as a required document in the solicitation, but it has now been added as an additional required submission with the Vendor's Proposal. Please submit the completed form in the Document Submission tab of the RFx in PASSPort as an attachment to your Proposal.

Question 8:

Can the City confirm April 1, 2027 as the go-live deadline, or is it the anticipated contract start date with go-live to be scheduled thereafter?

Answer 8:

April 1, 2027 is the current estimated contract start date. The go-live date would be after the contract starts and the selected Vendor does the necessary work for the system to go live. Since this is a new procurement, the NYPD awaits information from Vendors to propose as to how long the period would be from the contract start date to go-live. The NYPD also recognizes the possibility of delays within the procurement process which may result in the contract start date being later than the currently anticipated April 1, 2027 date.

Question 9:

Beyond the anticipated contract start (April 2027), is there a hard go-live deadline?

Answer 9:

See above response to Question 8.

Question 10:

Can the Department share its anticipated procurement timeline, including its best estimate, recognized as non-binding, of: (a) the duration of the evaluation period and the anticipated award date; (b) the expected period following award for completion of contract negotiations and contract registration; and (c) the resulting period available for implementation activities between a fully executed and registered contract and the April 1, 2027 agency program go-live date, by which the program is expected to be fully operational? These estimates materially affect each proposer's implementation planning, staffing commitments, and proposed schedule.

Answer 10:

The Paid Detail Application and Software Platform is a new procurement for the NYPD. It is not possible to provide exact timeframes. At this point, the due date for Proposals (as extended) is December 22, 2026. The NYPD anticipates about 2 to 3 months for the evaluation and selection process and then another 3 to 4 months until the anticipated contract start date. However, these timeframes are estimates only and are subject to change.

Question 11:

Will the implementation schedule proposed by the selected Contractor become a binding contractual commitment, and, recognizing that the program operates at no cost to the Department or to UMOS, does the Department contemplate remedies for Contractor-caused delay, such as reductions in the Platform Management Fee or liquidated damages?

Answer 11:

The selected Contractor's implementation schedule will be an enforceable performance commitment with defined milestones, data-migration testing, security approvals, user acceptance, parallel operations where needed, training, cutover, and stabilization requirements. A no-cost-to-NYPD funding model does not eliminate the operational harm caused by delay or failed implementation. The final terms of the negotiated contract between the NYPD and the selected

Vendor will contain appropriate remedies, which may include fee reductions, service credits, holdbacks, cure periods, or liquidated damages where legally and contractually appropriate. The NYPD will have a formal role in accepting operational readiness before production cutover.

Question 12:

Is any operational integration with PASSPort required beyond uploading solicitation documents?

Answer 12:

In order to submit a Proposal through PASSPort, Vendors must at least have set up a PASSPort account. A Proposer must be fully filed in PASSPort in order to be awarded. Therefore, the NYPD requests that all Vendors submitting a Proposal be fully filed in PASSPort as soon as possible. Proposers will need to upload solicitation documents and pricing information within PASSPort along with responding to the questionnaire. The selected Vendor will have many more interactions with PASSPort during the contract phase.

Question 13:

Is it possible to access a reference or demo environment of the current system for shortlisted proposers?

Answer 13:

This is a new procurement. Therefore, there is no comparable system in place to demonstrate or reference as the current system does not match the specifications of the new Platform that the NYPD seeks to procure. However, the NYPD has the opportunity to invite shortlisted Proposers to present their solutions after initial scoring.

Question 14:

Is there a current contract for this scope of services? If so, would you please provide the incumbent name and contract number?

Answer 14:

There is no current contract for this scope of services.

Question 15:

Have you hosted vendors to look at their technology and solutions?

Answer 15:

The NYPD has not hosted Vendors to examine their technology. However, this is an open solicitation. After initial scoring of Proposals ultimately received, NYPD has the option to host

Vendors for presentations as part of the solicitation process to demonstrate their proposed product and to answer questions from the evaluation committee.

Question 16:

Can the NYPD share which department is releasing this RFP?

Answer 16:

The Paid Detail Unit is seeking this new Platform to manage its Paid Detail Program. The RFP is being solicited by the Contract Administration Section, which is part of the NYPD's Acquisition Management Division. The solicitation is being done on behalf of the Paid Detail Unit which is part of the NYPD.

Question 17:

Can NYPD please share the list of attendees from the pre-bid conference on July 14th?

Answer 17:

The list of attendees is attached to this Addendum #4.

Question 18:

Could you please provide any materials shared during the conference, including the presentation, meeting recording, Q&A, attendee information, or other related documents that may be available for prospective proposers?

Answer 18:

The slide deck and attendance list from the Pre-Proposal Conference are attached to this Addendum #4. Vendor questions asked during the conference are answered throughout the "Questions Received from Vendors" section. A meeting recording will not be provided.

Question 19:

Can NYPD please share the materials presented during the pre-bid conference on July 14th and any subsequent Questions and Answer documents?

Answer 19:

All materials, including the slides, are attached to this Addendum #4. Questions asked during the conference are included at various points throughout this Vendor question section of the Addendum #4. Questions received have been categorized by topic.

Question 20:

Will the Department confirm that, for purposes of the list required by Section IV.B.3, a qualifying law-enforcement agency engagement is one in which the agency itself has contracted for and authorized the proposer's services and for which the proposer is presently operating a comprehensive solution encompassing the scope of services described in Section III, and that agencies where only individual officers, Clients, coordinators, or other users have created accounts on the proposer's Platform, absent an executed agency agreement, are not counted as agencies the proposer "currently operates"?

Answer 20:

The request for a list of projects set forth in Section IV.B.3 is clear as written. All Proposers are invited to demonstrate their experience to the best of their ability. As part of the description of their past experience, Proposers may include clarification about the exact nature of any existing contracts/ agreements with law enforcement entities.

Question 21:

Because the market includes several distinct service models, will the Department require each proposer to classify each listed engagement into one of the following categories, and to disclose the number of current engagements in each: (a) comprehensive programs, consistent with the solution the Department seeks under Section III of this RFP, in which the proposer itself performs Platform operation, officer eligibility administration, Client onboarding, scheduling support, invoicing, officer payment, agency-fee remittance, collections, financial-risk assumption, reporting, and ongoing support; (b) software-only relationships in which agency personnel operate the program using the proposer's technology; (c) engagements consisting of individually registered officers or Clients without an agency contract; (d) one-time, temporary-event, or marketplace transactions; and (e) advisory or subcontracted relationships? Clear category definitions would allow the Evaluation Committee to weigh comparable experience on a consistent basis across all proposals.

Answer 21:

The NYPD does not mandate that each Proposer explicitly classify their engagements based on the phrasing of this question. Once again, all Proposers are invited to demonstrate their experience to the best of their ability in their Proposals. It is up to the individual Proposer to make clear the nature of their relevant experience.

Question 22:

Will the Department require each proposer to certify that the engagement counts, agency totals, and operating figures stated in its proposal reflect current, contracted engagements the proposer actively operates, excluding cumulative or lifetime totals, self-registered individual users, pilot, trial, test, or proof-of-concept deployments, and one-time or marketplace transactions unless separately identified as such, and to explain the methodology used to calculate any agency count that also appears in the proposer's marketing or public statements? Will the Department reserve the right to verify a sample of reported engagements through references or supporting documentation such as an executed contract, award notice, or purchase order?

Answer 22:

The minimum requested information related to demonstrated experience is set forth in the RFP. For law enforcement and non-law enforcement experience, the NYPD asks for account name, contact person name, dates of operation, and number of Clients served. Any additional information is at the Proposer's discretion. The Department reserves the right to verify reported engagements upon request, but this is not a requirement of the initial Proposal.

Question 23:

Where a proposer's complete agency engagement list, contract status, and operating volumes may constitute competitively sensitive commercial information, will the Department permit a proposer to provide its largest and most comparable contracted law-enforcement engagements in the technical proposal and submit its remaining complete agency engagement information through a separately marked confidential submission available to the Department solely for verification and evaluation? Separately, if a complete list remains required within the technical proposal itself: (a) what is the process for designating portions of a proposal as trade-secret or competitively sensitive commercial information under New York Public Officers Law §§87(2)(d) and 89(5), and (b) will the Department provide notice and an opportunity to object before any responsive disclosure?

Answer 23:

As per Section 3-03 (a)(15) of the PPB Rules, "Proposers should give specific attention to the identification of those portions of their proposals that they deem to be confidential, proprietary information or trade secrets and provide any justification why such materials, upon request, should not be disclosed by the City. Such information must be easily separable from the non-confidential sections of the proposals." Vendors may accordingly request that portions of their Proposals remain confidential, but the NYPD cannot guarantee confidentiality.

Question 24:

The solicitation requires certain proprietary information (for example, SOC 2 reports, certified financial statements, and the customer list) that should be redacted upon a records request. How does the City advise proposers to submit such confidential information within the proposal?

Answer 24:

See above response to Question 23.

Question 25:

Section III sets out a comprehensive scope of services. For each engagement listed under Section IV.B.3, will the Department require the proposer to identify which of the Section III service functions it actually performs for that agency, and to state whether the proposer operates the referenced program or provides technology that agency personnel use to operate the program

themselves, so the Evaluation Committee can gauge each proposer's experience against the full scope this contract requires rather than against the provision of technology alone?

Answer 25:

The minimum requested information related to demonstrated experience is set forth in the RFP in Section IV.B.3. Proposers should include the information that they feel best demonstrates their experience in their Proposal.

Question 26:

Will continuing, multi-year program administration be evaluated separately from temporary events or limited-duration deployments, and will proposers be required to identify which of their listed engagements and references involve a continuing program rather than a specific event or short-term deployment?

Answer 26:

As set forth in the RFP, the NYPD asks Proposers to list dates of operation for any law enforcement or non-law enforcement experiences. Within these general parameters, Vendors are invited to demonstrate their relevant experience to the best of their ability. Evaluators will score based on the information provided.

Question 27:

To assess each proposer's present capacity to perform at the Department's estimated volume, will the Department ask each proposer to state, for its largest current contracted comprehensive law-enforcement programs (for example, its five to seven largest), on a current-annual basis: (a) hours administered from eligibility through officer payment; (b) hours for which the proposer funds officer payment before, or regardless of, Client collection; (c) participating officers; (d) Clients and locations served; (e) dollars invoiced; and (f) dollars advanced by the proposer ahead of Client collection, and to present these current-annual figures separately from any cumulative, lifetime, or since-inception totals of jobs, hours, transactions, users, or payments? Current-annual operating figures and historical cumulative figures measure different things and separating them would allow the Committee to evaluate all proposals on an equivalent basis.

Answer 27:

As set forth in the RFP, the NYPD asks Proposers to list dates of operation for any law enforcement or non-law enforcement experiences. Within these general parameters, Vendors are invited to demonstrate their relevant experience to the best of their ability. Evaluators will score based on the information provided.

Question 28:

Will the Department require each proposer to demonstrate, with supporting evidence rather than assertion, (a) its largest current weekly officer and agency funding obligation; (b) its average

weekly amount advanced during the most recent twelve months; (c) its total amount advanced during its most recent fiscal year; and (d) the source of funds used to meet those obligations? Will this information be considered both in evaluating each proposer's ability to support the Department's Post-Services Payment Option at the program's estimated peak volume and as demonstrated evidence of financial capability under Section IV.B.4?

Answer 28:

As set forth in the RFP, the NYPD asks Proposers to list dates of operation for any law enforcement or non-law enforcement experiences. Within these general parameters, Vendors are invited to demonstrate their relevant experience to the best of their ability. Evaluators will score based on the information provided.

Question 29:

Will proposers be required to disclose whether officer and agency payments are supported by operating cash, owner equity, bank debt, revolving credit facilities, factoring or receivables financing, outside investors, Client prepayment, or fees charged to officers for accelerated payment?

Answer 29:

The NYPD requests that Proposers provide the best and most relevant information to support their financial capabilities to successfully implement this project on behalf of the NYPD.

Question 30:

Will the Department require each proposer to disclose whether, in its current programs, it charges officers, Clients, or agencies any fees beyond its stated contractual administrative or Platform fee, including, for example, payment-acceleration or instant-pay fees charged to officers, subscription or access fees, payment-portal or convenience fees, or surcharges beyond direct credit-card processing pass-through, together with the amount and recipient of each such fee? Where a proposer's current revenue model depends on fees that would not be permitted under this contract, that information bears directly on the Department's evaluation of the sustainability of the proposer's pricing and its financial capability under Section IV.B.4.

Answer 30:

No additional requirements will be added to the RFP. The revenue models that Vendors may use with other entities are not relevant to this solicitation which sets forth its own payment models.

Question 31:

As part of its responsibility and financial-capability determination, will the Department require each proposer to disclose all principals and entities holding a ten percent (10%) or greater beneficial ownership interest, any private-equity or institutional investor interest acquired within the preceding twenty-four (24) months, and any change in ownership or control during that period?

Answer 31:

The disclosure requirements for this contract are those that are legally required, requested in the RFP, as well as those that are required as part of a Proposer's PASSPort disclosures and Local Law 34 compliance (see required Doing Business Data Form).

Question 32:

Will the Department require that the personnel proposed to lead implementation, and the team responsible for ongoing program management, have respectively implemented and managed contracted law-enforcement paid detail programs of comparable size, scale, and comprehensive scope to the program described in Section III of this RFP?

Answer 32:

The minimum requested information related to demonstrated experience is set forth in the RFP. Proposers should represent their relevant experience within their Proposals.

Question 33:

Will Proposers be required to disclose any executed agency contracts that have not reached full production operation of the contracted scope of services on a continuing basis, as distinct from pilot, event-based, or software-only deployments, so that agencies under contract but not yet fully implemented are identified separately from agencies in full, ongoing operation?

Answer 33:

No. The disclosure requirements for this contract are those that are legally required, requested in the RFP, as well as those that are required as part of a Proposer's PASSPort disclosures and Local Law 34 compliance (see required Doing Business Data Form).

Question 34:

Will the Department reserve the right to select and contact references from a proposer's complete engagement list, including agencies not among the proposer's preferred references, and will proposers be required to authorize their references to discuss the precise scope of services provided, implementation performance, payment performance, system incidents, customer service, and contract compliance?

Answer 34:

The NYPD reserves the right to contact any references listed by the Proposer. There are no additional requirements related to references.

Question 35:

Will agency names, logos, or Client lists presented in a proposal be considered in scoring only where the underlying relationship can be verified as a current, contracted engagement, and otherwise be excluded from the evaluation of relevant experience?

Answer 35:

The minimum requested information related to demonstrated experience is set forth in the RFP. The NYPD will therefore evaluate a Proposer's listed experiences based on the information provided in the Proposal.

Question 36:

What registrations, certifications, qualifications, or other requirements we would need to meet before submitting a proposal.

Answer 36:

All minimum qualifications are set forth in the RFP as well as the other solicitation documents. Please review this Addendum #4 as well for more information on any requirements that must be in place upon proposal.

Question 37:

Are there bonding, insurance, or security vetting requirements for the vendor and its principals that a foreign based company should be aware of before submitting?

Answer 37:

The selected Vendor must meet Vendor integrity standards in order to be awarded. The minimum insurance limits are listed in the Schedule A attached to this Addendum #4.

Question 38:

Can you please clarify the following statement? “The successful vendor must have an existing Platform and application that allows for substantial expansion in the number of the uniformed officers that could potentially participate in the Paid Detail program.” Do you expect vendors to already have a Platform that just needs to be customized?

Answer 38:

NYPD is open to: (1) Vendors having an existing Platform with customizations, or (2) Vendors creating a completely original product specialized to the NYPD. Either “from scratch” or “out of the box” solutions will be considered as long as the Vendor’s proposed solution fully meets the needs/requirements of the NYPD as set forth in the RFP.

Question 39:

Does the requirement that the vendor have "an existing platform and application" capable of supporting scheduling, assignment, billing, and reporting need to be a platform with prior US or public-safety sector deployment specifically, or can comparable experience from other markets satisfy this requirement?

Answer 39:

The minimum requested information related to demonstrated experience is set forth in the RFP. The NYPD asks for a list of projects with non law-enforcement entities and a list with law-enforcement entities. Other relevant experiences outside of law enforcement can be recorded on the former list.

Question 40:

Would the NYPD accept a proposal for an already existing box product that has customization options available or is also a mostly custom application? Does the product need to be developed from scratch or would mostly from scratch also be accepted?

Answer 40:

See above response to Question 38. The NYPD is open to either an existing box product or a completely custom Platform as long as it fully meets the Department's requirements as set forth in the RFP.

Question 41:

Whether a company may partner or form a teaming arrangement with an existing software company to submit a Proposal.

Answer 41:

Subcontracting is permitted under this contract.

Question 42:

Whether there are any specific requirements regarding subcontractors, partners, or software providers.

Answer 42:

Any subcontractors utilized must be approved by the NYPD.

Question 43:

Given the weekly payroll/direct-deposit obligations to officers described in the solicitation, is a US bank account or US banking relationship a proposal-stage requirement, or something a vendor would need to establish only if selected?

Answer 43:

All prospective Proposers must be able to demonstrate that they have the financial capacity to meet the UMOS compensation requirements and the NYPD administrative fee requirements at the time of Proposal submission.

b. PAYMENT MODELS AND PRICING

Question 44:

Must proposers support both the pre-services and post-services payment models, or may they propose only one?

Answer 44:

As per the Price Proposal, the NYPD asks all Proposers to submit pricing for both the Pre-Services and Post-Services payment models. Proposers may also optionally submit an Alternative Payment Model of their own design, but the NYPD has no obligation to accept any Alternative Payment Models submitted.

Question 45:

Can the City confirm whether the fee may be submitted as either a flat dollar-per-hour fee or a percentage markup on the invoice? The pricing workbook contains a hidden "Percentage %" worksheet in addition to the visible "Hourly" worksheet.

Answer 45:

The NYPD requests that Proposers provide their fees as hourly rates per title and per year (i.e. flat dollar per hour fees). Please enter only the highlighted fields as instructed in the Price Proposal sheet. However, Proposers have the option to also submit an Alternative Payment Model for the NYPD's consideration. Vendors may propose a model based on percentage markups via this option although the Department has no obligation to accept these Alternative Payment Models.

Question 46:

Would the NYPD permit a separately itemized, one-time business verification and onboarding fee in addition to the hourly Platform Management Fee?

Answer 46:

The NYPD does not require the Contractor to perform business entity verification or authorized representative identity verification as part of the Client onboarding process. The NYPD will

continue to be the sole party authorized to determine Client eligibility, meaning that the decision of whether prospective Clients will be admitted to or denied from the Paid Detail Program will remain exclusively with the NYPD. Therefore, a one-time fee as described in the question is not permitted.

Question 47:

Would the NYPD permit an annual business revalidation fee covering updated business records, authorized representative verification, and ongoing eligibility documentation?

Answer 47:

The NYPD will not permit an annual business revalidation fee. As previously stated, the NYPD will continue to be the sole party authorized to determine Client eligibility and enforce eligibility requirements throughout the Client's tenure in the program.

Question 48:

Are additional fees permitted for enhanced verification of multiple authorized representatives or additional business locations?

Answer 48:

Additional fees are not permitted for the administrative functions listed by the question as they will remain the sole responsibility of the NYPD, not the chosen Vendor. The NYPD will exclusively vet Clients and determine their eligibility.

Question 49:

If separate verification charges are not permitted, must all client onboarding and verification expenses be incorporated into the proposed hourly Platform Management Fee?

Answer 49:

Proposers should take into account all expenses and incorporate them into the hourly Platform Management Fees. The NYPD will continue to be the sole party authorized to determine Client eligibility and enforce eligibility requirements.

Question 50:

Would the NYPD consider an alternative payment model that includes separately identified verification charges, provided the model maintains timely officer compensation, transparent pricing, and compliance with all applicable procurement requirements?

Answer 50:

The NYPD invites all Proposers to optionally submit an Alternative Payment Model for consideration by the NYPD in addition to the Pricing Proposals that are requested in the RFP. However, Client verification and eligibility will remain an NYPD obligation regardless of any Alternative Payment Models received.

Question 51:

Does the NYPD require the selected contractor to verify the authority of the business representative initiating or approving payments under the Pre-Services Payment Option?

Answer 51:

No. The NYPD will continue to be the sole party authorized to verify the eligibility of Clients and their business representatives.

Question 52:

Are the per hour billable hours to be calculated separately for each person? For example: If a client requests service at a specific location, and the service request lists five UMOS for the detail. Are those five to be calculated cumulatively or does each one have a separate billable hour?

Answer 52:

UMOS each receive separate compensation based on their hours worked and rank. Therefore, the amounts to be paid to each person are based on the hours worked and the applicable hourly rates for each person.

Question 53:

If a client fails to pay, are failure to pay penalties authorized to be charged to the client?

Answer 53:

The NYPD is open to considering reasonable late-payment charges as a credit-management tool. A Price Proposal that includes such late payment charges should be submitted as an Alternative Payment Model.

Question 54:

How will the City weigh and score pricing proposals across the Pre-Services, Post-Services, and alternative payment models?

Answer 54:

As stated in the RFP: "Award selection will be based on the Proposal (technical and pricing, including consideration of the application of any M/WBE price preferences) which is the most

advantageous to the City." The NYPD will consider the pricing submitted by Vendors for the Pre-Services, Post-Services, and any Alternative Payment Models.

Question 55:

Where a flexible payment structure allows both Pre- and Post-Services options, how will the City determine and document which payment method applies to which Clients?

Answer 55:

A hybrid payment model involving Pre-Payment options for some Clients and Post-Services options for other Clients will not be considered by the NYPD. The NYPD invites Proposers to submit their pricing for both Pre-Services and Post-Services Payment Models separately. Proposers may also optionally submit an Alternative Payment Model for the NYPD's consideration; however, no hybrid solution will be accepted as an alternative.

Question 56:

Please also clarify how and when the Department anticipates determining which payment option, or which combination of the two, will operate, for example, at contract award, during implementation, or on a Client-by-Client basis, as this determination affects each proposer's pricing of both options.

Answer 56:

The NYPD will review all Price Proposals received and then make a determination prior to contract award. The NYPD may issue a request for Best and Final Pricing Offers from Vendors still under consideration after the initial review of Proposals. These Best and Final Pricing Offers would be based on the final payment model selected. A hybrid payment model involving both Pre-Services Payments for some Clients and Post-Services Payments for other Clients will not be considered by the NYPD.

Question 57:

The Hybrid Payment Model (Pre- vs. Post-Service Tiers): The RFP invites alternative structures. So, we will ask the NYPD if we can segment Clients based on credit tier. High-risk or mid-market entities must utilize Option 1 (Pre-Services Payment), remitting funds 3 days in advance. Only vetted enterprise accounts (e.g., Fortune 500 retail chains, premier banks) will qualify for Option 2 (Post-Services).

Answer 57:

A hybrid payment model involving both Pre-Services Payments for some Clients and Post-Services Payments for other Clients will not be considered by the NYPD. As stated in the question, Proposers may also optionally submit an Alternative Payment Model for the NYPD's consideration; however, no hybrid solution will be accepted as an alternative.

Question 58:

Who sets and who enforces the guaranteed payment terms under the Post-Services Payment Option, and do these terms vary by Client? For example, which party determines net payment terms, creditworthiness, and the applicability of Pre- versus Post-Payment models per Client?

Answer 58:

As previously stated, payment terms will not vary by Client since the NYPD will not accept any hybrid payment model. The Department shall establish the governing payment rules in the contract and program terms. Under the Post-Services Payment Model described in the RFP, the Contractor is responsible for advancing required officer payments on the prescribed weekly schedule and for administering Client billing and collection. In addition, the NYPD will continue to be the sole party authorized to determine Client eligibility. Therefore, the selected Contractor may choose to perform credit checks if they wish to do so, but these checks would take place only after Clients have already been accepted into the Program by the NYPD.

Question 59:

Under Payment Option 2 (Post-Services), the Contractor is responsible for advancing officer payments weekly. Will the NYPD permit the Contractor to establish a credit-vetting protocol or require a refundable security deposit from commercial Clients before onboarding them to the Platform to mitigate bad-debt risk?

Answer 59:

The NYPD will continue to be the sole party authorized to determine Client eligibility. Therefore, the Vendor will not establish any credit-vetting protocols to accept or deny Clients. The Vendor will not be permitted to use refundable security deposits. Vendors may perform credit checks on Clients if they wish to do so but only after Clients have been accepted into the Program by the NYPD.

Question 60:

Will the Department confirm that the requirement to guarantee timely weekly disbursements to both the NYPD and UMOS, regardless of Client payment status, applies under both the Pre-Services and Post-Services Payment Options, and that a proposal that conditions the timing of officer or Department payment on the Contractor's collection from Clients will be considered inconsistent with this requirement?

Answer 60:

Yes. In either the Pre-Services or the Post-Services Payment Models, the Vendor has an obligation to guarantee timely weekly disbursements to both the NYPD and UMOS. These disbursements must take place regardless of Client payment status.

Question 61:

Under the Post-Services Payment Option, what mechanisms, such as Client pre-authorization, credit checks, defined payment terms, or security deposits, may the Contractor impose to manage its advance-payment and delinquency exposure, and are any such mechanisms prohibited?

Answer 61:

The NYPD will continue to be the sole party authorized to determine Client eligibility and payment terms. Therefore, the Vendor will not establish any credit-vetting protocols to accept or deny Clients. The Vendor will not be permitted to use refundable security deposits.

Question 62:

Factoring and Capital Relief: We are explicitly asking the NYPD to confirm if third-party financing or factoring mechanisms can be structured into the cash flow cycle to absorb DSO delays without burdening our balance sheet.

Answer 62:

The NYPD has no operational objection to a Contractor using lawful financing or factoring to manage its own cash-flow obligations, provided the arrangement does not alter the City's rights, delay or reduce weekly Uniformed Members of Service (UMOS) payments, reduce the 10% administrative fee, expose NYPD or UMOS to lender claims, or transfer Department data/receivables contrary to the contract. The Contractor will remain fully responsible for performance, even if a financing provider fails. Any assignment of receivables, security interest, or third-party access to Client/Department data requires explicit contractual authorization from the NYPD.

Question 63:

Shortening DSO: We should also ask if a credit card (or ACH, etc.) automation loop via the online portal can force real-time automated clearing upon check-out, squeezing the assumed 45-day DSO closer to 15 to 30 days.

Answer 63:

The NYPD supports automated electronic collection that shortens receivable time and improves payment reliability. ACH, card, or other approved methods can use pre-authorization and automated invoicing/collection after verified completion, subject to chargeback, dispute, security, and fee rules. The Platform shall not promise a specific DSO reduction unless the payment terms and Client authorizations support it. The preferred design is a Department-approved electronic payment workflow with real-time status, automated reminders, aging, and escalation. Any processing fees would be assumed to be accounted for under hourly Platform Management Fees under the contract and may not be charged to UMOS or reduce Department payments.

Question 64:

Consistent with the all-inclusive fee structure described in Section II.D, will the Department confirm that, under the Post-Services Payment Option, the Contractor may apply reasonable, clearly disclosed late-payment charges to Client invoices that remain unpaid thirty (30) days or more beyond approved terms, as a standard credit-management practice applied solely upon delinquency, and not as a charge for program services, provided that such charges are set forth in the Client's service terms in advance, that no such charge applies to any Client that pays within approved terms, and that UMOS and the Department remain paid in full on the required weekly schedule regardless of Client payment status? If permitted, will the Department require each proposer to disclose its late-payment charge schedule in its proposal, so that Client-facing terms are evaluated on a consistent basis across all proposals?

Answer 64:

The NYPD is open to considering reasonable late-payment charges as a credit-management tool. A Price Proposal that includes such late payment charges should be submitted as an Alternative Payment Model and therefore is not a uniform requirement of all Proposers.

Question 65:

To submit the optional alternative pricing proposals invited by the RFP, should these be submitted within the pricing workbook (same tab, a separate tab), or as a supplementary written proposal?

Answer 65:

To submit an Alternative Payment Model, please create a supplemental written Proposal and upload it in the attachment field labeled, "Alternative Payment Model Plans" within the PASSPort Document Submission tab. The Alternative Payment Model should also include all relevant pricing details (including a pricing workbook/ spreadsheet if applicable). If the NYPD decides to move forward with a proposed Alternative Payment Model, Vendor(s) still under consideration may be requested to submit a new Price Proposal for that Alternative Payment Model as part of a Best and Final Price Proposal request.

Question 66:

Does the NYPD require the Platform to support the collection and payment of coordinator fees for individuals managing paid detail assignments? The RFP's fee structure addresses officer compensation, the 10% administrative fee, and the Platform Management Fee, but does not reference a coordinator fee.

Answer 66:

The payment structure that the NYPD proposes is set forth in the Price Proposal. There is nothing set forth for a separate coordinator fee.

Question 67:

If a commercial Client defaults on a payment to the Contractor under the Post-Services model, what enforcement, collection, or legal assistance will the NYPD provide, given that the underlying security services were executed by active-duty NYPD officers?

Answer 67:

As set forth in the RFP under Section III, subsection A-IX, the Contractor assumes all financial risk associated with delayed or non-payment by Clients and will guarantee timely weekly disbursements to both the NYPD and UMOS. Under no circumstances shall the NYPD, its officers, or the City be held liable for Client delinquency.

Question 68:

The RFP notes that the Contractor collects and remits a separate 10% administrative fee to the NYPD. In the event of a Client default under Option 2, is the Contractor still liable to remit the 10% NYPD administrative fee on those uncollected hours?

Answer 68:

Yes.

Question 69:

Under the Post-Services Payment Option, the Contractor advances full officer compensation and the NYPD administrative fee before collecting from Clients. Will the Department require each proposer to disclose the number of current annual law-enforcement hours for which it pays officers or agencies before, or regardless of, receiving corresponding Client funds, and to distinguish those funded hours from hours for which the proposer only processes or facilitates payment after Client funds are received? Payment made from the proposer's own funds and payment processed only after collection represent materially different financial undertakings, and this distinction bears directly on the Section IV.B.4 financial-capability evaluation.

Answer 69:

No. The disclosure requirements for this contract are those that are legally required, requested in the RFP, and those that are required as part of a Proposer's PASSPort disclosures. Proposers should include any relevant details related to their experience within their Proposals.

Question 70:

Section II.D provides that Clients using the Paid Detail Program are responsible for exactly three payment components: the full compensation due to UMOS at NYPD-set hourly rates, the 10% NYPD administrative fee, and the Contractor's Platform Management Fee. Will the Department confirm that this structure is exhaustive, that the proposed hourly Platform Management Fee constitutes the Contractor's sole and all-inclusive compensation under this contract, and that no proposer may charge, or condition any service upon, any additional fee, charge, or surcharge of any kind or under any label to Clients, UMOS, or the Department, including but not limited to

access fees; subscription fees; licensing fees; technology or Platform fees; vendor or payment-portal fees; convenience fees; payment-processing or credit-card surcharges (other than the direct pass-through, at cost and without markup, of card-processing charges where a Client elects to pay by credit card); officer quick-pay, instant-pay, early-payment, or payment-acceleration fees; software development, customization, or enhancement fees; insurance or insurance-administration fees; onboarding or implementation fees; training fees; reporting fees; or support fees? If a proposer intends to charge any amount beyond the stated Platform Management Fee, will the Department require that amount to be fully disclosed and included in the price proposal, so that each proposer's stated Platform Management Fee, together with direct credit-card pass-through at cost, represents the complete and only cost of the program, and all fee offers are compared on an equivalent, total-cost basis?

Answer 70:

In the payment models set forth in this solicitation, the Contractor's hourly Platform Management Fee is intended to constitute the Contractor's sole and all-inclusive compensation under this contract. Any Proposal which imposes additional charges onto the NYPD will not be considered. Any Contractor who wishes to suggest credit-management fees such as late-payment charges should do so by submitting an Alternative Payment Model.

Question 71:

Sections II.D and III.IX provide that officers shall never incur service charges or fees and that UMOS payment is due no later than Friday of the week following completion of the detail. Will the Department confirm that this prohibition extends to any optional or elective fee charged to an officer, including any fee, discount, or deduction offered in exchange for receiving payment sooner (however denominated, e.g., "early payment," "instant pay," "expedited payment," or "payment acceleration"), such that every participating UMOS receives one hundred percent of the compensation due, on the required weekly schedule, at no cost to the officer?

Answer 71:

Elective fees charged to UMOS in exchange for receiving payments faster than required will not be permitted.

Question 72:

Section III.A: Our Platform will pay the officer on a regular basis (bi-weekly) at no cost to the officer. We offer the ability for the officer to receive their pay, or a portion of it, early if desired for a fee. Is that acceptable?

Answer 72:

Elective fees charged to UMOS in exchange for receiving payments faster than required will not be permitted.

c. SCOPE AND PROGRAM MODEL

Question 73:

Are officers at your sporting events like Yankee Stadium and Citi Field extra duty or just on-duty officers?

Answer 73:

The NYPD has Paid Detail personnel, in addition to non-paid detail personnel, at certain sporting and other events and venues.

Question 74:

How frequently does the NYPD anticipate the officer hourly compensation rates will change over the course of the contract term?

Answer 74:

Officer compensation rates can be expected to change periodically. The Platform will treat rates as configurable values that can be changed by authorized NYPD administrators whenever a collective-bargaining increase takes effect. Rate changes shall be effective-dated so that past assignments retain the rate that applied when the work was performed.

Question 75:

How often have the officer hourly compensation rates changed historically (for example, over the prior five years)?

Answer 75:

The rates have increased once in the last 5 years. Rates may change periodically pursuant to updates to the collective bargaining agreements of UMOS.

Question 76:

How many distinct hourly rate tiers currently exist among participating UMOS?

Answer 76:

There are currently four principal officer compensation tiers in the available June 18, 2026 rate schedule: Captain group, $87 per hour; Lieutenant group, $68 per hour; Sergeant group, $61 per hour; and Police Officer/Detective group, $49 per hour. Because eligibility policy and rank can change, the Platform resulting from this solicitation must be capable of adding, retiring, and renaming groups as well as changing the effective-date of payment rates to these groups.

Question 77:

Beyond the approximately 6,500 of 33,000 uniformed officers currently participating, how much incremental expansion does the NYPD anticipate over the contract term?

Answer 77:

The Platform must allow for potential expansion of both the numbers of UMOS participating in the program and/ or the numbers of Clients participating in the program without requiring a Platform or software update(s) or major license renegotiation if participation expands.

Question 78:

What is the expected peak volume of concurrent users and transactions the Platform must support?

Answer 78:

Capacity planning must account for the Platform's potential growth to accommodate a greater uniformed population, plus Clients and administrative users.

Question 79:

Is there an estimated timeline for the officer base (6,500 → 33,000) and Client base (300 → ?) to grow?

Answer 79:

There is no estimated timeline.

Question 80:

Under Option 2 of the payment schedule, the contractor is required to be the primary payee for all UMOS and must bill at a net 30 level. Would you be able to provide historical data regarding the number of clients requesting service that have defaulted on payment? What is the total number of clients that have participated in the past?

Answer 80:

Information regarding the default rate is not available. Current source material shows 309 active Clients and 569 locations as of July 30, 2026, with continued growth and 17 contracts pending at that time.

Question 81:

What are the historical payment cycle and delinquency or nonpayment rates for participating clients?

Answer 81:

The NYPD is unable to provide the requested information at this time.

Question 82:

What is the estimated maximum weekly funding exposure the contractor should be prepared to advance?

Answer 82:

The NYPD is unable to provide the requested information at this time.

Question 83:

How many administrative users (NYPD Admin) and Agency Coordinators will use the Platform simultaneously?

Answer 83:

Approximately 200.

Question 84:

Historically, how many details have been scheduled? Ideally, we would like this information over the last three years.

Answer 84:

There are approximately 450 Paid Detail shifts worked by UMOS per 24 hour day.

Question 85:

Historically, what is the average number of hours per detail? Ideally, we would like this information over the last three years.

Answer 85:

8 hours.

Question 86:

Does NYPD anticipate any details to be scheduled and managed on the Platform but no officer payment? If so, what percent of the annual details do they anticipate that to be?

Answer 86:

The NYPD Paid Detail Unit does not anticipate a normal category of completed Paid Detail assignments that are intentionally scheduled and managed with no officer payment. As a business rule, performed work will generate the applicable officer compensation, subject to the program's minimum-pay and other approved rules. The Platform will still support zero-pay or reversal records for legitimate exceptions such as a timely cancellation, no-show, duplicate entry, administrative correction, or an assignment that never commenced. Those exception records will require a reason code and audit trail. Therefore, the expected percentage as a normal operating model will be effectively zero, apart from documented exceptions.

Question 87:

Does the NYPD centralize all coordination of UMOS paid details through the Paid Detail Unit (PDU), or may individual officers coordinate their own relationships with Clients? If the latter, approximately how many internal PDU coordinators manage this function?

Answer 87:

Paid Detail coordination will remain centralized through the PDU and the authorized Department system. Individual UMOS are not permitted to create private scheduling relationships with Clients, self-assign, switch assignments, or arrange for another member to work a detail outside the authorized process. The PDU will retain control over eligibility, posting, staffing rules, assignments, exceptions, cancellations, and supervisory oversight. The number of employees performing coordination functions may change with staffing and workload, so the Platform will use configurable role-based access rather than depending on a fixed coordinator count.

Question 88:

Will officers who either have their own company or work independently outside of the paid detail program be allowed to accept jobs on the platform?

Answer 88:

No. Paid Detail coordination will remain centralized through the PDU and the authorized Department system. Individual UMOS are not permitted to create private scheduling relationships with Clients, self-assign, switch assignments, or arrange for another member to work a detail outside the authorized process.

Question 89:

Does the NYPD require the contractor to perform business entity verification and authorized representative identity verification as part of the standard client onboarding process?

Answer 89:

The NYPD does not require the Contractor to perform business entity verification or authorized representative identity verification as part of the Client onboarding process. The NYPD will

continue to be the sole party authorized to determine Client eligibility, meaning that the decision of whether prospective Clients will be admitted to or denied from the Paid Detail Program will remain exclusively with the NYPD. Only Clients vetted and admitted by the NYPD will be onboarded within the selected Vendor's Platform.

Question 90:

What verification criteria, approval procedures, and documentation retention requirements must the contractor follow before granting a business access to request Paid Detail assignments?

Answer 90:

The NYPD will continue to be the sole party authorized to determine Client eligibility, meaning that the decision of whether prospective Clients will be admitted to or denied from the Paid Detail Program will remain exclusively with the NYPD. The Contractor's obligation will be to set up newly admitted Clients within the Platform so that they can request assignments.

Question 91:

Section III.A.XI addresses communications. For clarity, can any or all Clients communicate directly with officers, and is such communication required outside of a scheduled shift?

Answer 91:

Clients may communicate with UMOS only for legitimate assignment-related needs within the controlled Platform. Communication will generally relate to an active or upcoming authorized detail, such as access instructions, approved post information, or a documented operational change. Clients are not permitted to use messaging to privately recruit, select, schedule, negotiate with, or build an off-Platform work relationship with individual UMOS. Messages outside a scheduled shift will be limited to necessary pre-shift or post-shift administrative matters and remain visible to authorized PDU/supervisory personnel.

Question 92:

Beyond the approximately 6,500 of 33,000 uniformed officers currently participating, how much incremental expansion does the NYPD anticipate over the contract term?

Answer 92:

There is no fixed schedule for growth. The number of UMOS that are currently participating in the Paid Detail program may or may not significantly expand in the future. The 33,000 figure will be treated as a scalability requirement or potential upper design population. Current source material shows 309 active Clients and 569 locations as of July 30, 2026, with continued growth and 17 contracts pending at that time. The Platform must scale without requiring a re-Platform or major license renegotiation if participation expands.

Question 93:

What assignment rules does the Paid Detail Unit apply today, and does the City expect these rules to change under the selected Contractor?

Answer 93:

The Paid Detail Unit currently controls the assignment process. Paid Detail assignments will go through the PDU and the authorized Department system. Individual UMOS are not permitted to privately arrange work with Clients, self-assign, switch assignments, substitute another member, or otherwise bypass the authorized process. UMOS must also meet current eligibility requirements, including eligible rank, duty status, command approval, enrollment requirements, applicable hour limits, and no active suspension, deactivation, or other disqualifying restriction. The selected Contractor shall implement these rules, not create or control them. The NYPD may change assignment rules based on Department policy, collective bargaining, operational needs, legal requirements, or command direction. The software for the new Platform resulting from this solicitation will therefore allow NYPD to configure and effective-date rules without requiring a major software change.

Question 94:

§III.VII provides that Clients post available shifts, while the Overview provides that the PDU assigns officers. What is the City's preferred workflow in the Platform from job posting to job staffing?

Answer 94:

The preferred workflow is: a Client submits a detail request within the Platform which is then routed to the NYPD’s Paid Detail Unit for approval and possible edits; then the Platform releases the authorized opportunity to eligible UMOS under Department rules; an eligible member accepts the detail within the Platform; the Platform records the assignment and prevents unauthorized switching; the Platform verifies attendance; and the completed detail flows to payment, invoicing, administrative-fee, and reporting functions within the Platform. Clients may request service, but they are not permitted to privately select, negotiate with, or directly assign individual UMOS.

Question 95:

Should the Platform automatically assign a coordinator or supervisor to newly created Clients or jobs based on configurable rules, or does the NYPD intend for these assignments to be made manually by Department personnel?

Answer 95:

The PDU supports configurable automatic routing for administrative efficiency, such as assigning a Client or request to a PDU work queue based on borough, Client, event type, workload, or other Department-defined rules. However, the Department will retain manual override at all times. Operational supervisor staffing for a specific detail will remain a

Department decision based on safety, deployment, size, and risk. The Vendor selected from this solicitation will not independently decide whether supervisory coverage is required.

Question 96:

§III.B.III provides that only officers with an active Service Eligibility Flag may schedule or participate in paid details. Does the City envision a single eligibility indicator, or a separate permission distinguishing officers who may participate from those authorized to schedule or manage assignments on behalf of others?

Answer 96:

The NYPD Paid Detail Unit recommends separate role-based permissions. An active Service Eligibility Flag shall control whether a UMOS may participate in Paid Details. Separate permissions shall control who may create, approve, post, schedule, modify, supervise, or administer assignments on behalf of others. An eligible officer shall not automatically receive administrative scheduling rights. PDU administrators, supervisors, auditors, finance personnel, and other authorized users will each receive the minimum permissions needed for their duties, with all privileged actions logged.

Question 97:

II. UMOS Eligibility Restrictions: Please provide examples of eligibility criteria.

Answer 97:

Examples of UMOS eligibility criteria include: eligible rank under current Department policy; active and otherwise eligible duty status; required command approval; completed Paid Detail enrollment and required tax documentation; no active Paid Detail Unit (PDU) deactivation, suspension, or disqualifying restriction; compliance with Department and PDU rules; compliance with weekly and other applicable hour limits; and use of the authorized scheduling process. Current policy limits participation to Captain and below. Eligibility shall be controlled through a central flag that can be updated promptly when rank, duty status, command authorization, discipline, or other eligibility conditions change.

Question 98:

What formal instruments, such as contracts, request forms, or terms of service, does the City currently issue to Clients that govern the obligations among the City, UMOS, and the Client?

Answer 98:

The current program relies on formal Client/Vendor participation agreements or contracts, service/detail requests, W-9/tax documentation, insurance documentation including Certificates of Insurance, and Department program rules and/or instructions that govern participation. Assignment records and related forms document the specific service requested and performed.

As the Platform is implemented, these instruments shall be standardized, version-controlled, associated with the correct Client and location, and retained with effective dates.

Question 99:

Section III.A, Client Eligibility Management: Please provide examples of the criteria that will be used to exclude Client Eligibility.

Answer 99:

The NYPD will remain the sole party responsible for determining Client eligibility and enforcing eligibility requirements. However, examples of Client ineligibility or exclusion include: failure to pass required Department/Intelligence review; incomplete or false application information; missing or unacceptable insurance; missing required tax or agreement documents; prohibited or ineligible business/activity under Department policy; unresolved safety or operational concerns; delinquent payment or repeated payment failure; active suspension or termination from the program; misuse of UMOS or attempts to bypass PDU scheduling; serious or repeated rule violations; and conduct that creates legal, integrity, reputational, or operational risk. The PDU shall retain final discretion to approve, suspend, or deny participation consistent with Department policy and applicable law.

Question 100:

Can the City detail its expectations for how the Platform will vet eligible Clients?

Answer 100:

The NYPD will retain control over the vetting process for Clients. This vetting process will occur outside of the Platform by the Department. However, the Platform will serve as a repository for data needed to track status/results without exposing sensitive information to the Client or contractor beyond what is necessary. The decision of whether prospective Clients will be admitted to or denied from the Paid Detail Program will remain exclusively with the NYPD. Even once the NYPD deems Clients eligible and the Vendor sets them up to use Platform, the Platform will establish an automated eligibility flag that notifies the NYPD if insurance expires and blocks deficient Client's from entering requests for new details.

Question 101:

Section III.A
IV. Customization: Would you please provide examples of the policies and procedures you would like incorporated into our software and practices?

Answer 101:

The Platform will incorporate Paid Detail Unit (PDU) rules covering UMOS eligibility, assignment authorization, staffing and rank requirements, work-hour limits, scheduling, cancellations, no-shows, attendance, sign-in/sign-out, suspensions and deactivations, supervisory

review, and prevention of unauthorized assignment switching or off-Platform scheduling. The current workflow also calls for PDU approval before opportunities are released to eligible UMOS. The system shall also include separate role-based permissions so an officer who is eligible to work Paid Details does not automatically have authority to schedule, approve, modify, or administer assignments for others. Other controls include Client onboarding and vetting, W-9 and insurance management, secure communications with supervisory visibility, rate and payment controls, delinquency monitoring, complete audit logs, inspections, reporting, supervisory overrides, and data export. The Contractor will support the full workflow while NYPD retains operational authority.

Question 102:

The RFP assigns the Contractor collection, advancing, disbursement, and consolidated 1099 issuance (§III.IX), W-9 document management, review, and approval (§III.X), and collection and pass-through of the 10% NYPD administrative fee (§III.IX). Beyond these, what additional program-administration duties, if any, does the City contemplate for the Contractor?

Answer 102:

In addition to collection, advancing, disbursement, 1099 administration, W-9 management, and the 10% administrative fee, the Contractor should support the full program workflow.

The NYPD will continue to carry out the administrative operations of the Paid Detail Program while utilizing the Platform. For example, the NYPD will remain responsible for vetting and admitting eligible Clients, but the Vendor will have to set up new Clients in the system and store the relevant documents pertaining to their eligibility to be uploaded by the Paid Detail Unit. The Platform will take in requests for details by Clients, route the requests for approval and potential alterations by the Paid Detail Unit, and then release these assignments to UMOS who can then accept them within the Platform. The Platform will automate UMOS eligibility criteria so that officers can only select assignments for which they are eligible. To this extent, the Platform facilitates assignment scheduling. The Platform will also verify attendance, allow for secure messaging, and include data display and storage such as dashboards, audit logs, data export, and backups/disaster recovery. Other duties include rate management, invoicing and reconciliation, delinquency tracking, and notifying the NYPD if Client insurance expires. The Platform will have controlled interfaces with Department/City systems to accomplish these tasks.

Question 103:

Does the NYPD intend to outsource any Paid Detail Unit staffing or administrative functions, or is the procurement strictly for the technology Platform and application?

Answer 103:

The NYPD does not intend to outsource staffing or administrative functions. The Contractor will administer the technology, financial processing, and routine administrative workflow. PDU will retain all governmental, operational, supervisory, integrity, and disciplinary authority. See

response to Question 102 for a more detailed description of how the Paid Detail Unit will administer the program using the new Platform.

Question 104:

What is the expected frequency and volume of report generation (daily, weekly, on-demand)?

Answer 104:

The Platform will support scheduled and on-demand reporting. PDU operations use recurring financial and operational reporting, including bi-weekly performance reports, payment/delinquency tracking, inspection and compliance reporting, and frequent ad hoc requests from executive staff, auditors, commands, and oversight entities. The system will support daily operational dashboards, weekly/bi-weekly/monthly scheduled reports, year-to-date comparisons, and on-demand queries without degrading transaction performance. Authorized users will be able to export underlying data with appropriate security controls.

Question 105:

What are the data points and metrics that you want to be able to track related to the program? Are there other things besides just the hours and what we get paid on that are important to understand in order to keep track of the program and the hours worked and where they worked?

Answer 105:

Please see the details contained in the RFP for the full scope of services requested by the NYPD. This includes the specific metrics the Platform will track as well as the full range of functionalities the Platform must be able to perform.

Question 106:

Does the City require the Platform to track W-9 expiration or periodic re-validation and notify stakeholders in advance; and if so, what advance timeframe does the City prefer (for example, 30, 60, or 90 days)?

Answer 106:

A Form W-9 will be treated as a controlled tax document whose status will be current, not as a document with a universal fixed expiration date. The Platform shall track the version on file, verification date, tax-identification changes, legal-name/entity changes, and any Department-required re-certification cycle. It will support configurable advance notices when the NYPD requires refreshed documentation. Rather than hard-code 30, 60, or 90 days as a W-9 'expiration,' the system should allow NYPD to set the review interval and trigger immediate re-validation when material Client information changes.

Question 107:

Please clarify whether this requirement is intended to allow the PDU to verify that the information necessary for IRS 1099 reporting has been collected, or whether the system must store and display completed IRS Form W-9 documents for review.

Answer 107:

The Platforms will store and display completed IRS Form W-9 documents for review. As set forth in Section III, subsection A of the RFP, the Platforms will have the capability to provide W-9 Document Management, Notification, Review, and Approval, and Document Access. After UMOS upload their W-9 forms, Paid Detail Unit stakeholders should be notified when a new W-9 is uploaded so that they can review them.

Question 108:

Section III.A.VIII addresses the electronic paid detail slip. Can the Department provide a sample paid detail slip, or a complete list of the data fields that will appear on the electronic slip, so that generated slips contain exactly the information the Department and its stakeholders require?

Answer 108:

Please see sample current slip attached. The electronic slip shall at minimum support: unique assignment/detail ID; Client/vendor and location; business/location identifier; date; tour start/end; post/location instructions; required rank and staffing; assigned UMOS identity/rank/tax or Department identifier as permitted; hourly rate; scheduled and verified hours; check-in/check-out timestamps; meal/break information when applicable; supervisor information; Client/site contact; cancellation/no-show/exception status; attendance verification; notes; approvals; and an audit history. Final fields will be mapped from the legacy system and approved by NYPD before go-live.

Question 109:

Will the City require all Client payments to be settled electronically?

Answer 109:

Yes.

d. INSURANCE

Question 110:

Under a model in which each Client procures and maintains coverage, verification is continuous. Policies lapse, renew, and change mid-term. Will the Department require the Platform to continuously monitor and re-verify Client coverage throughout the contract term, and what is the Department's expectation when a Client's coverage lapses or is found not to cover detail activity mid-assignment? Where a proposer carries comprehensive coverage directly and names the Department as an additional insured under that coverage, does that continuous-verification

obligation become unnecessary, and would the Department view such vendor-carried coverage naming the NYPD as providing more reliable and continuous protection than Client-by-Client verification?

Answer 110:

Clients must maintain insurance consistent with the City of New York's insurance requirements as set forth in the "Schedule A for Clients" document attached to this Addendum #4 throughout their tenure as a Paid Detail Client. Vendors are responsible for storing the documentation in the Platform and creating an automated flag for insurance. This flag will notify the Client and the NYPD at certain dates related to insurance expiration. There should be notification 30 days before policy expiration, the day of policy expiration, and then 30 days after expiration. The final notification will also block the Client from making any new assignment requests. The hold will only be lifted once updated insurance is uploaded by the NYPD.

The NYPD will continue to be the sole party authorized to determine the eligibility of Paid Detail Clients and enforce insurance provisions throughout their time in the program. The selected Vendor's insurance policy cannot serve as a substitute for Client insurance.

Question 111:

Please confirm whether the Contractor is required to verify and monitor that each Client maintains the liability insurance required under Section III.A.XV, and if so, what documentation or certification process the Contractor must implement.

Answer 111:

The Platform will store insurance documents collected by the NYPD from Clients and create a flag to notify the NYPD if insurance coverage expires. However, the NYPD will continue to be the sole party authorized to determine the eligibility of Paid Detail Clients and enforce insurance provisions throughout their time in the program. See response to Question 110 for specifications for the automated flag.

Question 112:

Does the City require the Platform to maintain copies of insurance documentation (for example, Client Certificates of Insurance) and generate automated notifications prior to policy expiration or renewal?

Answer 112:

Yes. The Platform shall serve as a repository for insurance documents by Client and, where applicable, by covered location. It must also create an automated flag to notify the NYPD of insurance expiration. See response to Question 110 for specifications related to the automated flag.

Question 113:

Who bears ultimate responsibility for the quality, validity, and adequacy of Client-provided insurance, including the risk that a facially valid certificate represents a policy that excludes the detail activity? Is the Platform's obligation limited to collecting certificates, or is the Platform expected to warrant that Client coverage actually responds to the exposure? Please clarify where liability rests if Client coverage is later found inadequate.

Answer 113:

The Platform's obligation is to serve as a repository for insurance certificates collected by the NYPD and notify the Department should coverage lapse via the automated flag. The NYPD will continue to be the sole party authorized to determine the eligibility of Paid Detail Clients and enforce insurance provisions throughout their time in the program.

Question 114:

Please confirm whether statutory workers' compensation coverage requirements under this contract apply only with respect to the Contractor's own employees, or whether any workers' compensation obligation is intended to extend to UMOS working paid details.

Answer 114:

UMOS are not eligible for workers' compensation. Thus, workers' compensation requirements only apply with respect to the Contractor's own employees and not NYPD UMOS.

Question 115:

The RFP addresses workers' compensation in two respects: the Platforms must ensure each Client evidences any required New York State workers' compensation coverage (Scope of Work, "Insurance"), and the Contractor must maintain workers' compensation for its own employees (Appendix A, §7.02). Neither provision addresses coverage for a UMOS injured while performing a paid detail. Injuries sustained on paid details frequently do not arise from law-enforcement action at all, for example, a slip, trip, or fall at a Client work site; injuries caused by ice, weather, or premises conditions; or vehicle- and equipment-related accidents. Will the Department confirm who bears responsibility for injuries sustained by UMOS in the course of paid detail assignments, and specifically whether such injuries are treated as line-of-duty and covered by the City in all circumstances, only where the injury arises from law-enforcement action, or under some other standard? Clear allocation of this responsibility before proposals are submitted would ensure that no injured officer's coverage depends on after-the-fact determinations of duty status or causation, and that all proposers price the same obligation.

Answer 115:

The Schedule A for Vendors, which was attached to Addendum #1 and updated via this Addendum #4, specifies the required insurance types and minimum coverage limits. The insurance framework set forth in Appendix A would apply. UMOS are not eligible for workers' compensation.

Question 116:

If officer injuries during paid details are not covered by the City in all circumstances, or in order to eliminate any gap, dispute, or delay in coverage at the moment an officer is injured, will the Department require, uniformly of all proposers, that each proposer state whether its program provides New York State statutory workers' compensation coverage for participating UMOS as a standard, included feature of its proposal, at no cost to the officer and at no cost to the Department, and where a proposer instead relies on occupational-accident or any other form of coverage in place of statutory workers' compensation, that the proposer identify that coverage, its carrier, the classification under which it is written, and its limits, so that materially different forms of injury coverage are not evaluated as though they were equivalent?

Answer 116:

UMOS are not eligible for workers' compensation.

Question 117:

Will the Department further confirm (a) that officer injury protection offered only as an optional purchase, or funded through fees charged to officers or amounts deducted from officer compensation, would be inconsistent with the requirement that officers never incur service charges or fees; and (b) that this requirement will be applied to all proposers on the same basis, required of all or excluded for all? Coverage of this kind protects the Department and its officers regardless of which proposer is selected, and removes any gray area among the City, the Client, and the Contractor as to who responds when an officer is hurt.

Answer 117:

Officer injury protection offered as an optional purchase is not allowable given the requirement that officers never incur service charges or fees stated in the RFP.

Question 118:

Please provide Schedule A referenced in Appendix A, Article 7, specifying the required insurance types, minimum coverage limits, and additional insured requirements applicable to this RFP. Please also confirm whether the general insurance framework in Appendix A, Article 7 (including Sections 7.02–7.06) applies to the Contractor in full, or will be modified/limited given the nature of the Platforms/software services being procured (as opposed to on-site professional services).

Answer 118:

The Schedule A for Vendors, which was attached to Addendum #1 and updated via this Addendum #4, specifies the required insurance types and minimum coverage limits. The Insurance framework set forth in Appendix A would apply.

Question 119:

Section III.A.XV states that "Client must provide multi-million dollar 'A' rated comprehensive liability insurance coverage for the agency, officers, and customers." Please confirm the specific minimum limit(s) intended by "multi-million dollar" coverage.

Answer 119:

Please see the “Schedule A for Clients” document attached to this Addendum #4 which lists the specific insurance limits for Clients.

Question 120:

Does the Contractor (Proposer awarded the contract) have any independent obligation to procure or maintain insurance coverage naming or protecting NYPD UMOS (officers), separate from the liability insurance required of Clients under Section III.A.XV? If so, please specify the type(s) of coverage, minimum limits, and whether NYPD and/or UMOS must be named as additional insureds.

Answer 120:

Please see the Appendix A and attached Schedule A for Vendors (updated via Addendum #4) to see Contractor insurance requirements and applicable minimums. Only the City of New York must be listed as additional insured.

Question 121:

Is the Contractor required to maintain Commercial General Liability (CGL), Professional Liability/Errors & Omissions, Cyber Liability, and/or Crime insurance under this Agreement, and if so, in what minimum amounts? Given that the Platforms will process sensitive PII of UMOS and Clients (per Section III.A.XIV – Data Security), please confirm specifically whether Cyber Liability insurance is mandatory and, if so, its minimum required limit.

Answer 121:

The Schedule A for Vendors has been updated to align with the NYPD Cloud Rider. Previously there was a discrepancy between the two. The minimum insurance limit for Cyber Liability was $1 million. The minimum limit has now been updated to no less than $10 million per occurrence and $20 million in aggregate to match the NYPD Cloud Rider.

Question 122:

Please confirm whether the workers' compensation coverage referenced in Section III.A.XV is solely the Client's obligation, or whether the Contractor bears any responsibility to confirm or facilitate proof of such coverage.

Answer 122:

The NYPD will continue to be the sole party authorized to determine the eligibility of Paid Detail Clients and enforce insurance provisions throughout their time in the program. The Platform must only notify the NYPD if insurance coverage expires via the flag functionality. See response to Question 110 for specifications related to the automated flag.

Question 123:

Please clarify whether "the agency" referenced in Section III.A.XV ("comprehensive liability insurance coverage for the agency, officers, and customers") refers to NYPD, the Client's own business, or the Contractor.

Answer 123:

In this section, "the agency" refers to the NYPD.

Question 124:

Please confirm the required A.M. Best (or equivalent) rating and whether self-insurance or captive insurance arrangements would be acceptable for any portion of the required coverage.

Answer 124:

The only acceptable forms of insurance are set forth in the RFP. See the Appendix A and the attached Schedule A for Vendors. Clients must provide 'A' rated comprehensive liability insurance with the City of New York named as additional insured.

Question 125:

The predominant liability in armed paid-detail work arises from the law-enforcement conduct of uniformed officers (e.g., use of force, firearms discharge, wrongful detention, and care, custody and control). Will the Department require each proposer to demonstrate that its proposed liability coverage specifically extends to bodily injury and property damage arising from off-duty law-enforcement activity performed by armed, uniformed UMOS; that such coverage is NOT subject to the exclusions for law-enforcement activity, use of force, or firearms discharge commonly found in standard commercial general liability policies; and that the coverage is written on a security-guard / law-enforcement class code or program rather than a generic commercial general liability classification?

Answer 125:

The specific insurance requirements and the limits for each type of insurance are set forth in the Schedule A for Vendors which was released as part of Addendum #1 and updated in Addendum #4. This Schedule A requires Proposers to have generic commercial general liability insurance, not coverage specifying law enforcement activity.

Question 126:

Insurance industry practice distinguishes between (i) technology, professional, or administrative-services liability policies, which respond to errors or omissions in software or program administration, and (ii) security-operations liability policies, underwritten and classified for armed security activity, which respond to bodily injury and property damage arising from the conduct of armed, uniformed personnel at standing posts and details. Because paid detail assignments place armed, uniformed UMOS in precisely that security role, will the Department require each proposer to identify the classification under which its proposed liability coverage is written and to submit with its proposal the policy declarations and classification pages, or equivalent underwriter documentation, demonstrating that the coverage is underwritten for armed security / law-enforcement operations and extends to the NYPD and to each UMOS working a paid detail? Because coverage properly written for this exposure carries a materially higher premium than technology or administrative liability coverage, will the Department also confirm that (a) conforming coverage is a requirement of the proposal itself, such that each proposer's Platform Management Fee must be inclusive of the full cost of such coverage at the time of proposal submission, and (b) the awarded Contractor will not be permitted to increase, adjust, or renegotiate its Platform Management Fee after award on account of acquiring, upgrading, or maintaining the coverage this contract requires?

Answer 126:

The Vendor's Platform Management Fee should be inclusive of all costs, including insurance costs. As stated above, the specific insurance requirements for prospective Proposers and the limits for each type of insurance are set forth in the Schedule A for Vendors which was released as part of Addendum #1 and updated in Addendum #4. This Schedule A requires Proposers to have generic commercial general liability insurance, not coverage specifying law enforcement activity.

Question 127:

Individual Clients, retail establishments, houses of worship, private office buildings, typically carry commercial liability that excludes law-enforcement and firearms exposure, and may not reliably maintain such coverage. Where a proposer carries comprehensive 'A'-rated coverage at the vendor level that covers the Department, the officers, and affected Clients for the detail activity (with NYPD named as additional insured), would the Department consider that single-source model preferable to requiring each Individual Clients, retail establishments, houses of worship, private office buildings, typically carry commercial liability that excludes law-enforcement and firearms exposure, and may not reliably maintain such coverage. Where a proposer carries comprehensive 'A'-rated coverage at the vendor level that covers the Department, the officers, and affected Clients for the detail activity (with NYPD named as additional insured), would the Department consider that single-source model preferable to requiring each Client to separately procure and maintain coverage, such that Clients would be relieved of that obligation? The Department would thereby receive uniform, guaranteed coverage that does not vary with the financial capacity or policy quality of each individual Client.

Answer 127:

As previously stated, the selected Vendor's insurance policy cannot serve as a substitute for Client insurance. The NYPD will continue to be the sole party authorized to determine the eligibility of Paid Detail Clients and enforce insurance provisions throughout their time in the program. Client insurance requirements have been clarified in this Addendum #4.

Question 128:

Will a proposer be deemed fully responsive where it provides such comprehensive vendor-carried coverage in lieu of requiring, collecting, and verifying individual Client certificates of insurance?

Answer 128:

See response to Question 127.

Question 129:

A certificate of insurance is, by its own terms, informational only; it confers no coverage, does not amend the policy, and does not reflect policy exclusions. Accordingly, a Client-provided COI does not establish that the underlying policy actually responds to off-duty law-enforcement activity. Will the Department require proof beyond a certificate, such as the relevant endorsements or policy language, demonstrating that coverage reaches this exposure and is free of the exclusions noted in Question 23? How will the Department verify that a certificate represents coverage that in fact responds?

Answer 129:

The NYPD will continue to be the sole party authorized to determine the eligibility of Paid Detail Clients and enforce insurance provisions throughout their time in the program.
The Platform must only flag Client insurance lapses for the NYPD and block new detail requests from being entered. See response to Question 110 for specifications related to the automated flag.

Question 130:

Please detail the expected verification process. Specifically: what documentation beyond a certificate of insurance must the Platform obtain; against what standard must each Client's coverage be reviewed to confirm it reaches off-duty law-enforcement exposure and is free of relevant exclusions; how frequently must coverage be re-verified; and what are the Platform's obligations when a Client's coverage lapses, is cancelled, or is found not to respond?

Answer 130:

The NYPD will continue to be the sole party authorized to determine the eligibility of Paid Detail Clients and enforce insurance provisions throughout their time in the program. Therefore, the NYPD will collect insurance documents and use the Platform as a repository for those certificates. A Client whose required coverage expires must be automatically flagged and

blocked from new assignment activity until the required documentation is restored. See response to Question 110 for specifications related to the automated flag.

Question 131:

The Cyber, Technology E&O Insurance coverage states that the limit must include limits of no less than $10M per claim and $20M in the aggregate. Is the expectation that the proposer has these limits in place at the time of submittal, upon award, or before the program goes live?

Answer 131:

The minimum limit for Cyber Liability has been updated within the new Schedule A for vendors to reflect $10M per claim and $20M in the aggregate as stated in the question. Vendors should indicate in their Proposal whether they will meet the insurance requirements. The effective date for insurance should be at the time of award since the NYPD will be unable to register the contract without a certificate of insurance from the selected Vendor.

Question 132:

RFP §III.A.XV states the Client must provide multi-million dollar 'A' rated comprehensive liability insurance coverage for the agency, officers, and customers. What is the City's expectation if a Client cannot meet this insurance requirement at the time of engagement?

Answer 132:

The insurance requirements for Clients have been clarified in this Addendum #4 via the attached Schedule A for Clients. It is expected that Clients meet all insurance requirements at the time of engagement. Please see response to Question 110 for procedures should a Client's insurance lapse.

Question 133:

In the event a Client cannot independently meet the coverage requirement in RFP §III.A.XV, would the City want the Contractor to provide or facilitate the appropriate coverage for these jobs?

Answer 133:

As stated previously, the selected Vendor's insurance policy cannot serve as a substitute for Client insurance. The NYPD will continue to be the sole party authorized to determine the eligibility of Paid Detail Clients and enforce insurance provisions throughout their time in the program.

Question 134:

Is there is a Schedule A? It is referenced in Appendix A, but I did not see Schedule A in the documents. This is supposed to outline the minimum insurance limits required. Will you please let me know if this has been posted and we just can't see it, or if it will be posted later?

Answer 134:

The Schedule A for Vendors was not originally released with the solicitation. However, it was released with Addendum #1 and updated via this Addendum #4. It contains the exact insurance requirements.

e. INTEGRATIONS AND SUPPORT

Question 135:

What are the City's current and anticipated policies for secure digital attendance verification (for example, geofencing, biometric confirmation, QR/scan check-in, or supervisor sign-off)?

Answer 135:

The current system for attendance includes an attendance app as well as a physical sign-in sheet. The requirements related to attendance verification have changed with this Addendum #4. See Section II of this Addendum for details. The NYPD will not use any GPS system for attendance.

Question 136:

Which mission-critical features must remain functional offline? The RFP requires offline functionality for mission-critical features but does not specify which features must operate without connectivity.

Answer 136:

At minimum, an officer and supervisor must be able to access the assigned Client/location, date, tour, post instructions, reporting/contact information, and basic safety instructions when connectivity is unavailable. The Platform must also permit offline capture of check-in/check-out times, attendance exceptions, supervisor notes, and incident/exception information, then synchronize those records securely when service returns. Eligibility changes, new assignments, financial transactions, analytics, and final payment processing shall require a verified connection so stale offline information does not create unauthorized participation or payment.

Question 137:

Exact scope of the features considered "mission-critical" for the offline functionality requirement.

Answer 137:

Mission-critical offline functions include viewing an already-authorized assignment; Client/location, date, tour, post, and contact information; essential post/safety instructions; cached proof of the officer's assignment; offline check-in/check-out capture; supervisor roster/contact data; and attendance verification via the Vendor's API or operational exceptions for later synchronization. Offline mode shall not permit a user to create a new eligibility status, accept a newly posted job from stale data, alter rates, authorize payments, or perform other actions that require real-time validation.

Question 138:

What system is currently in use by the Paid Detail Unit from which the report catalog must be migrated, and who is its vendor?

Answer 138:

The Paid Detail Unit currently relies on a legacy FoxPro-based system for assignment, Clients, payment, personnel, and reporting functions. The application is maintained with support from the NYPD Information Technology Bureau.

Question 139:

Is it possible to access samples of the current reports and/or a data dictionary of the existing system?

Answer 139:

Yes, please see sanitized sample reports attached to this Addendum #4.

Question 140:

What technology is the current system built on (Platform, database, on-premise or cloud hosting)?

Answer 140:

The current Paid Detail Unit system is a legacy Microsoft FoxPro-based environment. It supports assignments, Clients, payments, personnel functions, and reporting and receives support from the NYPD Information Technology Bureau. It is best described as an internally supported legacy Department system rather than a modern contractor-managed Platform.

Question 141:

How many years of historical data must be migrated to the new Platform?

Answer 141:

It is not anticipated that any data will need to be migrated.

Question 142:

What is the approximate volume of existing records today (officers, Clients, assignments, historical transactions)?

Answer 142:

Available source data provides a reliable current operating baseline, but not a complete count of all historical records. As of July 30, 2026, the bi-weekly report shows 6,517 active UMOS and 79,235 filled details YTD.

Question 143:

Do UMOS use personal devices (BYOD) or Department-issued devices to access the application?

Answer 143:

UMOS use only Department-issued devices for the Paid Detail Program.

Question 144:

Must NYPD Admin and Agency Coordinator users authenticate via NYPD's existing Active Directory / SSO?

Answer 144:

Yes.

Question 145:

Are there blackout periods (events, holidays, special operations) during which deployments or migrations cannot take place?

Answer 145:

Yes. Notice of blackout periods will be provided to the selected Vendor as necessary.

Question 146:

Are there other internal NYPD systems the Platform must integrate with that are not explicitly mentioned in the body of the RFP?

Answer 146:

All required system integrations are explicitly outlined within the RFP. However, the system must also allow for additional API integration(s).

Question 147:

Can the City elaborate on external systems requiring API integration beyond CityPay, the NYPD Medical District system, and the NYPD Central Personnel Resource (CPR) system?

Answer 147:

The system must allow for additional API integration(s). These integrations include the following: payroll and timekeeping which would send officers' detail hours for payment and enforce caps on total weekly hours, access management such as single sign-on through active directory or Azure AD, plus role-based access tied to rank or unit, scheduling and roll call which prevents conflicts between detail shift and regular hours, city financial systems that handle Client invoicing, accounts, receivables, and revenue reconciliation, including the NYPD administrative fee, Client identity and registration (NYC.ID) which handles business account login, Vendor verification, and insurance certificate tracking, GIS and mapping (Esri ArcGIS for geocoding), CAD and pct. notification which alerts the local command so it knows which officers are working details in its area, and finally reporting and analytics which feeds the Department's data warehouse for audits and Comptroller oversight reporting.

Question 148:

Section III.A.IV. Customization: What integration methods are available to integrate with the NYPD Medical District system (Sick/Limited/Restricted) and the NYPD CPR (Central Personnel Resource) system?

Answer 148:

There are no current integration services provided for either the Medical or CPR applications; however, they both have API backends that can be extended depending on the specific requirements. Security considerations will be vetted with the ITB Information Security Division.

Question 149:

Sections III.A.II / III.B.II and III.A.IV reference a real-time "Service Eligibility Flag" and a data exchange with NYPD's Medical District and CPR (Central Personnel Resource) systems for officer Sick, Limited, and Restricted status and Command Code changes. Will the Department provide the technical specification for these and other referenced interfaces, including data schema, transport and protocol, and synchronization frequency, pre-award or post-award, so that respondents can appropriately scope the required confidentiality, access-control, and integration design? Can the Department also identify which integration methods are currently supported for external Platforms, such as REST or SOAP APIs, secure file transfer (SFTP), direct database connectivity, or message queues?

Answer 149:

Both applications natively support REST APIs. The Department will provide the necessary technical specifications and interface control documents (ICDs) post-award. Proposers should prepare their responses based on the information currently available in the RFP.

Question 150:

For legacy integration, what specific data transfer protocols (e.g., REST APIs, SFTP, Webhooks) are currently supported by the existing NYPD Medical District system and the Central Personnel Resource (CPR) system for daily status syncs?

Answer 150:

Both applications natively support REST APIs, giving the NYPD the technical capability to build custom integration pipelines as required. Details will be provided to the Vendor once the contract has been awarded.

Question 151:

Technical documentation (protocol, data format, API availability) for the NYPD Medical District system.

Answer 151:

There is currently no technical documentation available for the NYPD Medical District system. The Platform natively supports REST APIs, and the technical capability exists to build out custom integration pipelines based on project needs.

Question 152:

Will NYPD provide interface specifications and sample data for the Medical District, CPR, CityPay, and existing paid Detail systems?

Answer 152:

The NYPD will provide interface specifications for the listed integrations upon implementation post-award.

Question 153:

Technical documentation for the NYPD CPR system for Command Code Changes, including access method and expected synchronization frequency.

Answer 153:

No external integration documentation is available at this time for CPR Command Code Changes. The system is REST API-capable for custom integration designs, but specific details

regarding access method will be provided to the selected Vendor post-award. Synchronization must occur weekly for Command Code Changes.

Question 154:

Is CityPay integration a day-one requirement, or is it part of a future roadmap?

Answer 154:

CityPay integration is part of a future roadmap.

Question 155:

Is technical documentation for the CityPay API available at this stage?

Answer 155:

No. This technical documentation for CityPay will be made available to the selected Vendor at a future date upon implementation.

Question 156:

Which specific payroll/tax system(s) must the Platform integrate with for W-2/1099 issuance, and in what data exchange format?

Answer 156:

There is no specific payroll/ tax system(s) which the Platform must integrate with for 1099 issuance, and there is no absolute required data exchange format. The NYPD requires that no later than the January 31st date after the end of each calendar year that each UMOS that participates in the Paid Detail Program be provided with a single 1099 that properly reflects the total compensation that they received from all Clients combined in that calendar year.

Question 157:

What is the expected format and number of training sessions, and for which audiences (UMOS, Clients, NYPD Admin)?

Answer 157:

Vendors must provide training manuals as well as some limited in-person training sessions tailored for the NYPD. Vendors will also provide training videos for UMOS and administrators of the Platform.

Question 158:

Section III.A.XIII requires replication of several named legacy reports: the Monthly Administrative Fee Deposit Report, Monthly Administrative Fee Report by Client, Bi-Weekly Payment and Assignment Summary Report, Executive Paid Detail Daily Roll Call, Executive Schedules and Time Count Reports, Nonpayment Report, Average Assignment Report, Fiscal Year Revenue Forecast Report, Client Activity Report, and Rank-Based Time Report. Can the Department provide sample templates, field-level specifications, or a data dictionary for each of these reports, so that respondents can confirm exact replication feasibility and format parity?

Answer 158:

Please see sample reports attached to this Addendum #4.

Question 159:

Further to Section III.A.XIII, can the Department provide a complete breakdown of the user roles and permission levels required for reporting access, including the data and functions each role may access?

Answer 159:

The selected Vendor will work to finalize roles and permissions with NYPD. At this time, such information will not be shared.

Question 160:

For 24/7/365 support, does the City require live telephone coverage 24 hours in addition to written support coverage?

Answer 160:

Yes. And 366 Days on Leap Years.

f. SECURITY AND COMPLIANCE

Question 161:

Where a Client communicates with an officer through the Platform's secure messaging feature, does the City require the assigned coordinator or supervisor to have visibility into those communications?

Answer 161:

Yes. PDU administrators and the assigned supervisory chain should have visibility into Client-to-UMOS communications conducted through the Platform. Communications can affect scheduling, post instructions, attendance, complaints, safety, and discipline. The system should preserve the full message record, sender/recipient, date/time, attachments, and any edits or

deletions in an auditable format. The Platform should discourage or block communications that create an unauthorized direct employment or scheduling relationship between a Client and an officer.

Question 162:

If supervisory visibility into secure messaging is required, does the City require real-time notification of these communications, or is view-only access to the message record sufficient?

Answer 162:

Routine messages can be available through view-only supervisory access and searchable audit records. Real-time alerts should be reserved for operationally significant communications such as cancellations, time or location changes, emergency conditions, safety information, complaints requiring immediate attention, or instructions that may conflict with PDU rules. The notification rules should be configurable by NYPD so supervisors are informed when action is needed without creating unnecessary alerts for routine messages.

Question 163:

The RFP requires robust authentication and authorization mechanisms but does not specify them. Can the City provide additional details regarding the authentication and authorization requirements for newly created user roles?

Answer 163:

The Platform must authenticate NYPD users through Microsoft IntraID as the identity provider. The solution should integrate with IntraID so that NYPD users sign in with their existing NYPD credential rather than having a credential created or managed within the selected Vendor's system. Microsoft IntraID is used only for NYPD employees. Users who are not NYPD members, including Clients and other external parties, should authenticate through NYCID. NYC.ID is a free account verification service managed by the NYC Office of Technology and Innovation (OTI), and anyone can create an account.

Question 164:

The RFP references both NYPD Admin and Platform Admin roles. Could the City clarify the functional differences between these roles and the permissions each is expected to have?

Answer 164:

NYPD Admin is an oversight role charged with overseeing the integrations between the Platform and various NYPD systems in order to ensure all UMOS eligibility criteria are applied correctly; therefore, they must be able to view all assignments and UMOS eligibility flags. The Platform Admin is charged with reviewing assignment requests from Clients, modifying them if necessary, and more broadly overseeing scheduled details within the Platform. They must have the ability to apply overrides within the system to enable or disable UMOS from accessing

assignments. These permissions will be clarified during the implementation process with the selected Contractor and are subject to change.

Question 165:

The Cloud Rider requires Security Incident notification within one (1) hour, while the SCY Attachment requires notification within 24 hours (telephone) and 48 hours (written). Can the City confirm which timeline governs and reconcile the two?

Answer 165:

One hour notification is required for security incidents.

Question 166:

In Section 2.9.1, there is a requirement to notify the NYPD SOC and Privacy Officer within 1 hour of discovering a Security Incident. Does this 1-hour reporting threshold apply specifically to confirmed data breaches of Personal Identifying Information (PII), or does it encompass any suspected infrastructure event (e.g., localized DDoS or isolated system downtime)?

Answer 166:

See above response. Notification within one hour is required for any security incident.

Question 167:

Cloud Rider §3.5.2 requires a SOC-1 Type II audit, a SOC-2 Type II audit, and an ISO 27001 audit, while RFP §III.XIV references "SOC 2" certification and §IV.B lists proposal submission requirements. For each artifact separately — SOC-1 Type II, SOC-2 Type II, ISO 27001, and cyber/technology E&O insurance — can the City specify whether it must be (i) submitted with the proposal, (ii) in place at contract execution, or (iii) achieved within a defined post-award window?

Answer 167:

SOC2 is required to be submitted with the Proposal.

Question 168:

Is a current SOC 2 Type II report required at the time of proposal, or is a commitment to obtain it during implementation sufficient?

Answer 168:

The SOC 2 Type II report is required with the Proposal submission.

Question 169:

The SCY Attachment mandates annual SSAE 18/SOC 1 Type II, SOC 2 Type II, and ISO 27001 audits. If the Contractor's organization is already globally ISO 27001 certified and utilizes a FedRAMP-certified cloud infrastructure provider, will the NYPD accept those existing corporate certifications in lieu of requiring separate, Platform-specific annual audits?

Answer 169:

Annual audit is required.

Question 170:

Cloud Rider §3.5.2 requires the Contractor to obtain independent third-party audits and certifications. Which of these certifications must be in place at the time of contract award?

Answer 170:

The SOC 2 or FedRAMP Certification must be in place at the time of Proposal submission.

Question 171:

For any certification required under Cloud Rider §3.5.2 that is not required to be in place at the time of award, what is the maximum time the City will allow the Contractor to achieve full compliance, measured from contract execution or from go-live?

Answer 171:

See response to Question 170.

Question 172:

To the extent the Contractor's underlying cloud service provider already holds FedRAMP authorization, does the City require any additional FedRAMP compliance activity at the vendor/application layer beyond the CSP's authorization?

Answer 172:

The selected Vendor must provide FedRAMP certification or SOC2 Type 2 certification.

Question 173:

If additional FedRAMP compliance is required at the vendor/application layer, at which impact level (Low, Moderate, or High) must it be satisfied, and by when (proposal submission, contract execution, or a defined post-award window)?

Answer 173:

Moderate level compliance must be satisfied by the time of Proposal submission. Each Vendor must provide its own FedRAMP or SOC2 Type 2 certification to operate.

Question 174:

Is a formal FedRAMP authorization required (and under which baseline: Low, Moderate, or High), or is alignment with practices sufficient without formal authorization?

Answer 174:

See above response to Question 173.

Question 175:

Section III.A.XIV provides that the Platform should be hosted in a government-approved cloud environment compliant with FedRAMP standards. Please confirm (a) whether FedRAMP Low, Moderate, or High is the applicable baseline, and (b) whether operating within the existing FedRAMP authorization boundary of a major cloud infrastructure provider (for example, a hyperscale provider's FedRAMP-authorized government or commercial cloud offering) satisfies this requirement, or whether the Department requires each vendor to hold its own FedRAMP Authorization to Operate. This clarification materially affects hosting architecture and cost, and a common understanding will ensure all proposers design and price their solutions to the same standard.

Answer 175:

See above response to Question 173.

Question 176:

NYPD Cloud Rider §3.6 requires generating, monitoring, and analyzing security audit logs containing the information specified in NIST SP 800-92, in a format agreed with the Department. Please confirm which specific NIST SP 800-92 log categories the Department requires vendors to demonstrate, and the expected delivery format (for example, CEF, JSON, or raw export).

Answer 176:

The selected Vendor must generate, retain, and deliver security audit logs consistent with NIST SP 800-92 (guide to computer security log management). At a minimum, the Vendor must demonstrate logging for the following categories:

1. Security software logs: antimalware/EDR, intrusion detection and prevention, firewalls and network access controls, VPN/remote access, Web proxies, vulnerability management, and authentication/identity services.
2. Operating system logs: system event (startup, shutdown, service configuration changes, (failures) and audit records (successful and failed logins, privilege use, account changes, file and policy access).

3. Application logs: client requests and server responses, account activity (creation, modification deletion, authentication), usage information, and significant operational actions (configuration changes, administrative actions, data exports).

Question 177:

NYPD Cloud Rider §5.2 requires FIPS 140-3 certified encryption modules, with FIPS 140-2 modules submitted for 140-3 testing acceptable as an interim solution for up to five years. Please confirm whether a cloud Platform provider's published FIPS 140-2 and 140-3 validation documentation is acceptable evidence for underlying Platform cryptographic modules, with any 140-2-only modules tracked against the five-year interim period, and please confirm the required cipher and digest standards for TLS and hashing algorithms.

Answer 177:

TLS 1.3 or higher and AES-256. Also, FIPS 140 standard along with compliance with FedRAMP requirements

Question 178:

Does the requirement that City Data remain in the United States extend to each of the following: sub-processors, cloud regions, disaster-recovery sites, and support operations?

Answer 178:

Yes.

Question 179:

Section 2.5.6 of the Cloud Rider states that all NYPD Data must remain in the United States. Does this data residency requirement restrict remote, view-only database access or read-only staging environment access by nearshore QA, DevOps, or Software Engineers located in Latin America during development, deployment, and testing phases?

Answer 179:

Yes. Data residency requirements do restrict any remote access. All NYPD data must remain in the US only.

Question 180:

Do provider-managed encryption keys, with NYPD control and audit rights, satisfy the key-ownership requirement? The Cloud Rider requires NYPD ownership of encryption keys unless the Provider demonstrates it is not architecturally feasible.

Answer 180:

Yes. The NYPD asks that Vendors bring their own key with a dedicated key vault (the encryption keys are generated and controlled on the NYPD's behalf). The NYPD decides who can use encryption keys, can rotate them, and can revoke or destroy them. If NYPD revokes a key, the Vendor loses the ability to decrypt the data.

Question 181:

How does the City wish to handle standard consumer-facing application terms of service presented to officers and Clients, given that the Cloud Rider voids all click-through, click-wrap, and end-user terms?

Answer 181:

The Vendor must confirm in writing that it will not enforce its consumer terms against City users. It must also suppress or replace those terms for City accounts where feasible, and give the City notice before changing any in-app terms.

Question 182:

Does logical multi-tenant data segregation satisfy the data-commingling prohibition, or does the City require physical or instance-level isolation of NYPD Data?

Answer 182:

Yes. Proposers must provide a dedicated, logically isolated tenant for NYPD data within a FedRAMP moderate authorized environment.

Question 183:

Cloud Rider, 2.5.3, Are usage analytics tools, such as Google Analytics, permitted under this clause?

Answer 183:

Shared analytics are not permitted.

Question 184:

To ensure our response accurately reflects the NYPD's expectations, please clarify whether the Data Commingling requirement applies equally to all hosted applications, including administrative systems that manage scheduling, billing, and payroll support, or whether the requirement is intended primarily for applications containing investigative, criminal justice, or similarly sensitive law enforcement information.

Answer 184:

The application in this solicitation is a scheduling system for managing Client requests for Paid Detail work. It is not intended to store or process investigative, criminal justice, or similarly sensitive law enforcement information. The data commingling requirement should be read in that context. Proposers should keep NYPD data logically separated from other clients' data, consistent with standard industry practice for hosted applications. No additional controls specific to criminal justice information are required for this application.

Question 185:

Are the background check, fingerprinting, and CJIS security clearance requirements applicable only to personnel with direct logical access to production data, or do they apply to all software developers working on the Platform's codebase in a non-production staging environment?

Answer 185:

All personnel working on the Platform require background checks, fingerprinting, security clearance, ...etc.

Question 186:

Is pentesting required on a specific cadence, and who audits or certifies it?

Answer 186:

The NYPD does not independently perform penetration testing. Penetration testing is performed as part of the third-party certification and assessment programs (FedRAMPS/SOC2) which must be recertified on an annual basis.

Question 187:

Must every Marketplace product and subcontractor environment independently meet the stated FedRAMP and SOC requirements?

Answer 187:

Yes. The selected Vendor must provide FedRAMP certification or SOC2 Type 2 certification at the time of proposal.

Question 188:

Is there any requirement, at the proposal submission stage, for a bidder to be a US-registered entity, or is this only required upon contract award

Answer 188:

All Proposers must be US-registered entities at the point of Proposal submission.

Question 189:

Whether the lead proposer must itself be an established software company.

Answer 189:

The lead Proposer must demonstrate that it has a Platform that can meet the NYPD's requirements as set forth in the RFP. Prospective Proposers must have SOC2 and FedRAMP certifications in place at the time of Proposal.

Question 190:

Which cloud providers are pre-approved by NYPD / NYC OTI for this type of solution (AWS GovCloud, Azure Government, others)?

Answer 190:

The NYPD does not mandate a specific provider. Proposer may propose any environment meeting security, connectivity, and performance requirements.

Question 191:

How many environments are contractually required (dev/QA/staging/production), and must any be isolated within the NYPD network?

Answer 191:

The selected Vendor will be required to provide and maintain four environments:

1. Development: used by the Vendor for configuration, customization and unit testing.
2. Quality assurance: (QA/Test): used for system, integration, regression and security testing.
3. Staging/user acceptance testing (UAT): a pre-production environment that mirrors production in configuration, versions and integrations. It will be used for NYPD acceptance testing and final release validation.
4. Production: the live operational environment.

Isolation requirements: production and staging/UAT must be hosted within the NYPD network, or within an NYPD-approved CJIS-compliant environment. They must be logically isolated from each other and from all non-NYPD networks. Any environment that stores, processes or transmits criminal justice information (CJI) or other NYPD sensitive data must comply with the FBI CJIS security policy and NYC cyber command/NYPD IT security standards.

Question 192:

Is dedicated connectivity (VPN or private link) to the NYPD internal network required for any of the integrations?

Answer 192:

Yes, for all integrations with NYPD internal systems. Any integration that exchanges data with systems hosted on the NYPD internal network will require dedicated, secure connectivity. Acceptable methods include a site-to-site IPsec VPN or a private connection as approved by NYPD ITB and consistent with NYC cyber command policies and standards, NYPD internal systems will not be exposed directly to the public internet.

Integration with external or cloud hosted services that do not touch NYPD internal network may use encrypted internet connection with strong authentication, such as Oauth 2.0 or mutual TLS, subject to NYPD security review. The final connectivity method for each integration will be confirmed during the design phase. The Proposer should describe its proposed connectivity approach for each integration and identify any hardware, software, or circuit requirements.

All connectivity is subject to NYPD security review, approval and ongoing monitoring.

Question 193:

What are the RTO/RPO (disaster recovery) requirements and backup frequency?

Answer 193:

The Recovery Time Objective (RTO) and Recovery Point Objective (RPO) is 5-15 minutes. The backup policy should be full weekly and incremental backups.

Question 194:

Are there NYPD IT / NYC OTI architecture standards the Platform must follow beyond what is mentioned in the RFP?

Answer 194:

No.

Question 195:

How long does the NYPD or NYC OTI security review / Authority to Operate (ATO) process historically take for a new vendor?

Answer 195:

This process typically takes 30 days.

Question 196:

Is an MDM (Mobile Device Management) solution required over the devices accessing the Platform?

Answer 196:

Yes.

Question 197:

What are the minimum supported iOS and Android versions required for the mobile application.

Answer 197:

The mobile application does not impose minimum IOS or Android version requirements. The application should be designed to be compatible across a broad range of operating system versions, allowing users to access it on the devices they already have without needing to upgrade their operating system. The NYPD will notify the selected Vendor in advance of any future change to supported versions.

Question 198:

Is multi-factor authentication (MFA) required for any specific role?

Answer 198:

Yes, it is required for all users.

Question 199:

Who will be NYPD's technical point of contact during the build and integration phase?

Answer 199:

The Project Manager involved in the implementation will be the technical contact. The Project Manager would be identified to the selected Vendor at the time that the Contract is registered and the selected Vendor is notified of the registration of the contract.

Question 200:

What is the expected process and acceptance criteria for UAT (User Acceptance Testing)?

Answer 200:

Functional UAT is to be performed by Paid Detail Unit. Non-functional requirements will be tested by ITB.

Question 201:

Is a parallel-run period with the current system expected before final cutover?

Answer 201:

While there may be a pilot period with a small number of members with the new Platform, it is not anticipated that there will be a parallel-run period of the complete new Platform before final cutover.

Question 202:

The Identifying Information Rider and Privacy Protection Rider §§9–12 require destruction of Identifying Information within 30 days of request, such that the data cannot be reconstructed. For data held in backup media using shared or tenant-level encryption architectures, please confirm whether cryptographic erasure, destruction of the applicable encryption key, rendering the affected backup data unreadable and unrecoverable, satisfies this requirement, or whether the Department requires physical removal of the data from backup media within the 30-day window.

Answer 202:

Contractors should follow NIST SP800-88 (formerly DoD 5220.22-M) guidelines and require "physical removal of the data from backup media within the 30-day window."

Question 203:

What are the data retention requirements (in years) for assignments, payments, and audit logs?

Answer 203:

The required data retention period is 12 years.

i. COMMUNITY HIRING

Question 204:

The RFP provides that an Income-Based Community Hire "does not need to perform services under this Contract" to be credited toward the Community Hiring Goal (RFP §VI, Community Hiring Requirements). Please confirm whether an individual meeting the income eligibility threshold under 74 RCNY § 1-02 qualifies regardless of the geographic location of their employment, or whether the individual must reside or work within New York City or New York State.

Answer 204:

An Income-Based Community Hire is not subject to a geographic residency or work-location requirement. An individual qualifies as an Income-Based Community Hire if they meet the income eligibility criteria established under 74 RCNY § 1-02, regardless of where they reside or

perform work. Income-Based Community Hires must have an individual or household income below 300 percent of the federal poverty guidelines, as defined in the rules.

Question 205:

The Community Hiring Goal is a best-efforts standard, and compliance is assessed based on whether the Contractor exercised best efforts (74 RCNY § 5-03; Community Hiring Rider, Compliance §A). Please confirm that where a Contractor advertises Employment Opportunities and notifies a Referral Source in accordance with 74 RCNY §§ 3-02(a) and 5-01, documented best efforts satisfy the requirement even where the number of qualifying Income-Based Community Hires available in the Contractor's labor market is insufficient to meet the numeric goal.

Answer 205:

The Community Hiring Goal is a best-efforts standard. Best efforts may vary across different Vendors and their circumstances. The City will determine whether the Vendor made best efforts on a case-by-case basis, which may consider how the Vendor was advertising Employment Opportunities, coordinating with Referral Sources or apprenticeship programs, reviewing qualified candidates, and taking other commercially reasonable actions required under the Community Hiring Rider and applicable rules.

Question 206:

Please clarify how the Community Hiring Goal will be applied when a contractor has limited or no commercially useful hiring needs during the contract term. Specifically, please confirm that compliance will be evaluated based on the contractor's documented best efforts and that the Community Hiring Rider does not require a contractor to create unnecessary positions, displace or reduce the work of existing employees, or hire individuals where no commercially useful employment opportunity exists.

Answer 206:

Yes. The Community Hiring does not require a contractor to create unnecessary positions, displace or reduce the work of existing employees, or hire individuals where no commercially useful employment opportunity exists. Contractors are, however, expected to make best efforts, which may include working with Referral Sources, advertising Employment Opportunities where applicable, reviewing qualified candidates, and contacting Office of Community Hiring (OCH).

Question 207:

Additionally, please advise whether the City will consider an adjusted numerical goal based on the nature of the services and the employment opportunities reasonably expected to result from this contract.

Answer 207:

No, not at this phase of the procurement.

Question 208:

For purposes of calculating the Community Hiring Goal, the Total Management Fee is derived from estimated annual UMOS hours. Please confirm the point at which the Total Value of the Contract is fixed for goal-calculation purposes: at award based on the projected Total Management Fee, or trued-up over the term based on management fees actually collected.

Answer 208:

The RFP states, “The Total Value of the Contract resulting from this solicitation is anticipated to be the amount of the selected Proposer’s Total Management Fee.” This Total Management Fee will be the amount of the awarded contract, which will come from the selected Vendor’s accepted final Pricing Proposal. Therefore, for goal-calculation purposes, the Community Hiring Goal will be set based on the projected Total Management Fee that is set forth in the selected Vendor’s accepted final Pricing Proposal rather than the actual fees collected over the contract term.

Question 209:

The RFP provides that the Community Hiring Goal is calculated on the Total Value of the Contract, defined as the selected Proposer's Total Management Fee (RFP §VI, Community Hiring Requirements). The Price Proposal workbook computes the Total Management Fee across a five-year term. Please confirm that the Total Value of the Contract for purposes of the Community Hiring Goal is measured over the five-year base term only and does not include the two three-year renewal option periods.

Answer 209:

The Community Hiring goal will be set based on the Total Value of the Contract (in other words, the Total Management Fee) across the five-year term, not including any potential renewal options. This Total Management Fee will be the amount of the awarded contract, which will come from the selected Vendor’s accepted final Pricing Proposal. Any Community Hiring goals for these possible renewals will be set and evaluated separately.

Question 210:

Section I Page 21 Lists local hiring requirements. Is their pay subject to prevailing wage? This would specifically apply to the customer care team? Also, how does Local Law 61 (Supplemental Benefit) affect the budget and has this been factored into the current pricing expectation?

Answer 210:

LL61 does not apply to NYPD UMOS. To clarify, Community Hiring is not local hiring and is based on economic factors. For this procurement, the awarded Vendor will be required to make best efforts to employ Income-Based Community Hires, who are individuals with an individual or household income below 300% of the federal poverty guidelines. This Paid Detail RFP is not subject to Prevailing Wage. Any Income-Based Community Hire would not be subject to Prevailing Wage except for specific work performed under a different NYC government contract which might fall under a Prevailing Wage Schedule.

VIII. ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

Due to the large volume of questions received, the NYPD will now accept additional questions until **Tuesday, November 24, 2026 at 4:00 PM.** This is the **final opportunity** to ask questions related to this procurement. Please E-Mail any additional Questions by this Deadline to tiana.urey@nypd.org, jordan.glickstein@nypd.org, and contracts@nypd.org.

Please execute the Acknowledgement of Receipt of this Addendum below and return the acknowledgement with your Proposal response. This is a required document upload in the PASSPort solicitation.

Please sign and return this Addendum, as provided below, with your bid in PASSPort.

Acknowledged by:

Company Name:	
Street Address:	
City, State, Zip:	
Telephone/Fax Numbers:	
Email Address:	
Authorized Representative (Print):	
Authorized Representative (Sign):	