



THE SCHOOL BOARD OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA
 SCHOOL BOARD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
 Procurement Management Services
 1450 N.E. 2nd Avenue, Room 650
 Miami, FL 33132

Direct All Inquiries To
 Procurement Management Services

Buyer's Name: Miranda James

PHONE: (305) 995- 1621

Email: mjames@dadeschools.net

TDD PHONE: (305) 995-2400

BID/RFP ADDENDUM

Date: 8/26/2026

Addendum No. 4

BID/RFP No. ITN-25-053-MJ BID/RFP TITLE: DISTRICTWIDE FUNDRAISING, SCHOOL-BASED SALES, AN

This addendum modifies the conditions of the above-referenced BID/RFP as follows:

Please find the answers to the questions received attached. The deadline has been extended until Thursday,
September 3, 2026 at 1:00pm EST. All other terms and conditions of the ITN remain the same.

All information, specifications terms, and conditions for the above-referenced BID/RFP, are included on the document posted on the Procurement Management website at <http://procurement.dadeschools.net>

The attached pages containing clarifications, additional information and requirements constitute an integral part of the referenced bid. If your bid/proposal has not been submitted, substitute the pages marked REVISED and mail your entire bid/proposal package.

I acknowledge receipt of Addendum Number 4

PLEASE NOTE: If your firm has forwarded a copy of this bid/proposal to another vendor, it is your responsibility to forward him/her a copy of this addendum.

(PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT BELOW)

LEGAL NAME OF BIDDER: _____

MAILING ADDRESS: _____

CITY, STATE ZIP CODE: _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER: _____ E-MAIL _____ FAX # _____

BY: SIGNATURE (Manual): _____
 OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

NAME (Typed): _____ TITLE: _____
 OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

ITN-25-053-MJ
DISTRICTWIDE FUNDRAISING, SCHOOL-BASED SALES, AND TRANSACTION OPERATING
SYSTEM (M-DCPS)
ADDENDUM 4

Questions and Answers

1. Revenue Routing: Does the District require all transaction revenues to route into a single, centralized central treasury bank account, or does the ITN support routing funds directly to individual school bookkeeper accounts, booster clubs, or athletic departments via individual merchant sub-accounts?

Answer: Each school has their own checking account, where individual accounts are associated with classes/clubs sponsoring fundraisers

2. Pricing Structure: Does the ITN allow for flat per-transaction fee structures (e.g., a flat convenience fee per ticket) as opposed to percentage-based fees or annual software subscription fees? How will flat per-transaction pricing models be evaluated in terms of cost scoring?

Answer: Proposers may submit a flat per-transaction pricing model, a percentage-based model, a subscription model, or another clearly defined pricing structure. All costs and fees must be fully disclosed in the proposal. Pricing will be evaluated in accordance with the cost criteria and methodology established in the ITN, considering the overall value and anticipated cost to the District, schools, and users.

3. Gate Scanning Hardware: For gate ticket verification, does the District expect the awarded vendor to supply, rent, or lease physical scanning devices/hardware to the schools, or will school staff utilize existing District-provided mobile devices (phones/tablets) to run the ticket validation software?

Answer: The District currently utilizes mobile devices to validate electronic tickets. Proposers should identify all hardware and software necessary to operate their proposed solution, including whether scanning devices must be supplied, purchased, rented, or leased. Solutions compatible with commonly available mobile devices are preferred. The District's existing ticketing arrangement should not be interpreted as a commitment under this solicitation.

4. Multilingual Requirements: What are the District's multilingual requirements for the parent-facing checkout interface, ticketing, and automated notifications (e.g., Spanish, Haitian Creole, etc.)?

Answer: The parent-facing checkout interface, ticketing functions, and automated notifications should support multiple languages to serve the District's diverse community. At a minimum, proposers should describe their platform's capabilities for English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole, including any additional languages available and the process for managing translations.

5. Out-of-State Business License: For out-of-state Proposers whose home state or municipality does not levy local business taxes or issue occupational licenses for technology/software service companies, what alternative documentation is acceptable to satisfy Exhibit 9, Item A (Local Business Tax Receipt)?

Answer: If the Proposer's home state or local jurisdiction does not require or issue a Local Business Tax Receipt, Occupational License, or equivalent business license for technology/software service companies, the Proposer may submit a signed statement on company letterhead certifying that no such license or tax receipt is required in its jurisdiction. The statement should identify the applicable jurisdiction and affirm that the Proposer is legally authorized to conduct business there. Supporting documentation, such as a state business registration or Certificate of Good Standing, may also be submitted if available.

6. Attorney Certification (Exhibit 12): Regarding Exhibit 12 (Proposer's Preference), Section 1 requires an attorney's certification. For out-of-state Proposers who do not employ in-house counsel, is an external attorney signature strictly mandatory, or can a corporate officer execute a self-certification affidavit regarding their home state's bidding preference laws?

Answer: An external attorney can be utilized to certify that the information provided is true.

7. Where/what section of our response should the majority of requirements as listed in Section 4.3 be placed?

Answer: Responses to the requirements listed in Section 4.3 should be included within the applicable sections and tabs identified in Section 6.2, Response Format. Proposers should clearly identify each requirement being addressed and may include cross-references to the corresponding page numbers. Responses should be organized so the evaluation committee can readily determine compliance with each requirement.

8. Section 4.4 requirements are somewhat redundant. Should we respond to these items multiple times, or can we refer to the page number where these items can be found? (For example, Section 4.4 asks for an Executive Summary, but under Section 6.2 - Response Format items, an Executive Summary is listed as Tab 5.)

Answer: You can refer to the page number where the answer can be found.

9. Will vendors be allowed to submit if they cannot provide an example of an existing District that they provide accounting functionality to that is greater than 200 schools?

Answer: Experience (Preferred) with Districts Exceeding 200 Schools.

10. Can the District confirm whether vendors are expected to maintain their own PCI DSS Level 1 Service Provider certification, including a current Attestation of Compliance (AOC), rather than relying solely on compliance inherited from third party hosting providers (e.g., Azure, AWS)?

Answer: Vendors may rely on compliance inherited from third party hosting providers, as long as all transactions occur on, and are stored within, the third party's certified infrastructure.

11. Does Miami Dade require vendors to provide SOC 1 Type II and SOC 2 Type II reports that cover the vendor's application, transaction processing, and internal controls? This would be the company's certification as opposed to just the environment they host data in such as their cloud provider.

Answer: The District does not require copies of these reports, only an attestation that certification has been acquired and is current. Vendors may rely on compliance

inherited from third party hosting providers, as long as all transactions occur on, and are stored within, the third party's certified infrastructure.

12. How will Miami Dade evaluate solutions where core functionality (payment processing, receipting, reconciliation, and reporting) is delivered across multiple integrated vendors or partner platforms, versus solutions delivered within a single, unified platform?

Answer: The District prefers a solution that provides a seamless and unified user experience. Proposals involving multiple integrated vendors or partner platforms should clearly explain how the components will operate as a coordinated solution, including accountability, data ownership, security, reconciliation, reporting, technical support, and the resolution of service-related issues. The complete solution will be evaluated against all ITN requirements.

13. Is Miami Dade seeking a single, unified platform that serves as the system of record for all payment types (online, in-person, cash, and check), including receipting, reconciliation, and reporting across all campuses and departments?

Answer: Miami- Dade is seeking a single system of record.

14. Will solutions be evaluated based on their ability to standardize financial processes and reporting across all 476 schools, versus supporting decentralized or site specific approaches?

Answer: Yes, solutions will be evaluated on their ability to standardize financial processes, controls, reconciliation, and reporting across the District while preserving appropriate school-level flexibility and authorized site-specific functions.

15. Should the system enforce role-based segregation of duties (e.g., item approval, refunds, disbursements) at both campus and district levels to support audit readiness and internal control policies?

Answer: As part of your response, please share any information about how your product can facilitate different levels of access and ensure role-based segregation of duties.

16. Does the District require real-time, district-wide reporting and audit visibility, including access to transaction-level and student-level data across all schools?

Answer: Yes. The District requires real-time, district-wide reporting and audit visibility, including access to transaction-level and student-level data across all schools, subject to applicable privacy, security, and access-control requirements.

17. Are vendors expected to demonstrate organizational scale and dedicated resources (e.g., implementation, training, and account management/support teams) to support a district of this size? If so, should this be quantified within the proposal's response?

Answer: Yes, proposers should demonstrate and quantify their organizational capacity and dedicated resources to support a District of this size. The response should identify proposed implementation, training, account-management, technical-support, and customer-service personnel, as well as staffing levels, relevant experience, availability, escalation procedures, and service expectations.

18. Please confirm your current systems: DISIS (student information), Focus (adult education & after-school care), Great Plains Accounting for Student Level Accounting, SAP for

district finance, and Online Schools Payments (OSP). GoFan for ticketing, Destiny Library software and Incident IQ.

Answer: For security reasons, any additional information outlining the District's current systems cannot be outlined at this time.

19. Can you please confirm the total number of school sites that should be considered for this ITN response? The document cites two different totals for building numbers.

a. Section 4.1 indicates 476 schools; yet in another section, specifies over 600 K-12, post-secondary and Charter School Locations.

b. Section 4.3.1.1 Core Criteria- Can your Platform support over 600 K-12, post secondary, and charter school locations operating concurrently?

Answer: The District currently operates approximately 476 schools. However, the proposed platform must be scalable and capable of supporting more than 600 K-12, postsecondary, charter, departmental, and other authorized organizational locations or configurations operating concurrently. Proposers should base their technical-capacity response on the larger requirement stated in Section 4.3.1.1.

20. Exhibit 6 requests that we provide the total value of the contract for the customer references. Could you please clarify what information you are looking for? Annual value?

Answer: Total value of the awarded contract with the customer that was submitted as a reference.

21. Where/what section of our response should the majority of requirements as listed in Section 4.3 be placed?

Answer: Responses to Section 4.3 should be placed within the applicable sections and tabs prescribed in Section 6.2, Response Format. Proposers may cross-reference page numbers when information appears elsewhere in the proposal, provided each Section 4.3 requirement is clearly addressed and readily identifiable to the evaluation committee.

22. Please confirm the payment-gateway model: will M-DCPS require vendors to use the district's merchant account, or may the solution include an integrated, PCI-compliant gateway with funds remitted to the district?

Answer: The District is seeking the most secure, dependable, and cost-effective payment-gateway structure. Proposers should describe whether their solution uses a District merchant account or an integrated PCI-compliant gateway, including the flow and timing of funds, settlement procedures, reconciliation, chargebacks, security responsibilities, merchant fees, and all associated costs. The final gateway and merchant-account structure will be determined through the evaluation and negotiation process.

23. What financial/ERP and student information systems (e.g., SAP, PeopleSoft, FOCUS) must the platform integrate with for nightly transaction posting and user authentication?

Answer: For security reasons, any additional information outlining the District's current systems cannot be outlined at this time.

24. Approximately how many simultaneous fundraising campaigns, web stores, and ticketed events run district-wide during peak periods, and what is the annual transaction volume in dollars and count.

Answer: The District is unable to provide a definitive estimate of simultaneous campaigns, stores, events, or annual transaction volume at this time. Proposers

should demonstrate that their solutions are scalable and capable of supporting districtwide operations across more than 600 school, departmental, charter, postsecondary, and other authorized configurations, including periods of peak concurrent activity.

25. Does the district expect a phased school-by-school rollout or a big-bang go-live? Please provide any mandated timeline milestones beyond the anticipated October 2026 contract start.

Answer: The District's preference is a coordinated districtwide implementation rather than an extended school-by-school rollout. Proposers should submit a detailed implementation plan identifying all major milestones, including configuration, integration, data migration, testing, training, communications, deployment, and post-launch support. The final implementation approach and timeline, including any necessary transition phases, will be established during negotiations with the selected proposer. The anticipated contract start remains October 2026.

26. The pre-proposal conference emphasized customer service, transparency, and simplifying fundraising for schools, while the RFP includes a comprehensive Scope of Services. Can the district clarify how these priorities should be weighted during the evaluation of proposals?

Answer: The District will evaluate proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria and methodology specified in the ITN. Customer service, transparency, and ease of use are important objectives that are reflected within the Scope of Services and the overall requirements of the solicitation. Proposers should clearly demonstrate how their proposed solution addresses all ITN requirements and supports these priorities. No additional weighting beyond the published evaluation criteria will be applied.

27. Resume submission - does the district want to see full background resumes? Or resume info and experience that is relevant to this request?

Answer: As mentioned in Section 7.3b, please provide qualifications and experience of all proposed key personnel. Resume info and experience will suffice.