



Addendum No. 2

City of Coquitlam

RFP No. 26-049

Pay Parking Mobile Payment Application

Issue Date: June 5, 2026

Total Page Count: 6

Proponents shall note the following amendments to the RFP documents:

REPLACE

R1) REPLACE

Proposal Submission Form delete and replace with **REVISED Proposal Submission Form **REVISION No 1**.**

QUESTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

Q1. For the Merchant of Record options, please confirm whether payment processing fees are expected to be passed to the parker in each scenario.

A1. Single flat fee that encompasses all operating costs for all card types and presented to the customer prior to payment.

Q2. The pricing template indicates that proponents should not modify the provided format. Please confirm how Merchant of Record-related fees (i.e., payment processing or gateway fees) are expected to be presented, given that no explicit field exists for these items.

A2. Merchant of Record fees should be included as part of the single flat fee that encompasses all operating costs.

Q3. Other than integration with pay stations, Genetec ALPR, FieldTicket, and payment processors, please confirm whether there are any additional systems (e.g., permit, financial, reporting, or back-office systems) that require integration.

A3. Compatible reporting format for data on parking usage including in ArcGIS format. Otherwise, no other system integration is required and proponents' customer interface can retain any proprietary elements/features, but will need to utilize common zone numbers.

Q4. Could the City please provide additional information regarding the evaluation team, including the roles or departments represented on the evaluation committee? Please also confirm whether each evaluator will be scoring the full proposal, or whether evaluators will be assigned to score specific sections based on their area of expertise.

A4. The City's evaluation team will be composed of staff representing various business and supporting units associated with the service provided and includes but is not limited to staff from the Transportation, Finance, Bylaw Services, and Information and Communication Technologies Divisions. Without prejudiced, the Evaluation Team may in its sole discretion may include third party contractors as part of the Evaluation Team and/or consult references as required.

Q5. Can the City clarify whether the underlying payment processing responsibilities and clearing of funds will be managed directly through the City's corporate accounts, or if the successful Proponent is expected to clear transactions through their own payment gateway before remitting revenue to the City? In alignment with the "City as Merchant of Record" model, will the City support a split-account configuration (e.g., routing funds through a secondary Moneris merchant account) to cleanly separate processing fees, convenience fees, and base parking revenues between the service provider and the City? Does the City permit the integration and concurrent use of multiple payment processors within the deployment architecture, or must all mobile application transactions route through a singular gateway designated by the City?

A5. The City is open to solutions where payment processing and settlement are managed either through the City's merchant account(s) or through the Proponent's payment processing infrastructure, provided the proposed approach satisfies the City's operational, financial, reporting, reconciliation, audit, and remittance requirements.

Regardless of the proposed model, the solution must:

- Provide robust reporting and reconciliation capabilities sufficient to support the City's financial controls, journal entries, and TransLink Parking Tax reporting and remittance obligations**
- Clearly identify all transaction fees, processing fees, commissions, and other charges associated with the Services**
- Support transparent segregation and tracking of parking revenues, fees, and remittances**
- Describe how payment settlement, chargebacks, refunds, and cash handling (if applicable) would be managed**

Proponents should describe their recommended payment processing and settlement model, including any merchant account requirements, payment gateway integrations, and revenue settlement processes.

- Q6. The RFP refers to integration with “future” City systems. Could the City please identify any future systems currently contemplated, planned, or reasonably anticipated during the contract term, and clarify what level of compatibility or future-readiness proponents should account for in their proposals?
- A6. Future systems include the new Pay Parking Station vendor and any compatible reporting system formats for data that include ArcGIS data.**
- Q7. Please confirm whether a City of Coquitlam or Tri-Cities Intermunicipal Business License would be required for the successful proponent providing a pay parking mobile payment application, particularly where the proponent does not maintain an office in the City and is providing the solution primarily as a software/service offering.
- A7. If the successful Proponent does not maintain a physical business location within the City and no Work is performed on City property, a City of Coquitlam or Tri-Cities Intermunicipal Business License is not required..**
- Q8. Could the City please provide a copy of the City’s Certificate of Insurance – Consultant Form referenced in the RFP?
- A8. As stated in section 2 of the RFP, all documents can be found here: [City Purchasing Information](#).**
- Q9. For Appendix A – Privacy Protection Schedule, please identify the specific categories of personal information the City considers to be collected, created, used, stored, disclosed, or accessed by the contractor in connection with the Services.
- A9. The City is unable to definitively identify all categories of personal information at this stage. The specific types of personal information involved will be determined through the Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) process following selection of the successful Proponent. Information may include, but is not limited to, names, email addresses, telephone numbers, license plate numbers, payment card information, GPS location data, IP addresses, and other information required to support the Services.**
- Q10. For Appendix A – Privacy Protection Schedule, please clarify whether the City considers pre-existing user account information held by the selected contractor to be within the City’s control or collected on behalf of the City, where a user already has an account with the contractor independent of the City’s parking program.
- A10. No. The City's requirements apply only to information collected, used, stored, disclosed, or accessed in connection with the City's parking program following implementation. Pre-existing user account information independently collected and maintained by the Contractor outside of the City's parking program would not be considered information collected on behalf of the City.**

Q11. For Appendix B – Privacy Impact Assessment for Non-Ministry Public Bodies, please clarify what the City considers to be the “initiative” for purposes of completing the PIA, including whether the initiative is limited to the City’s implementation of the mobile parking payment application or includes the contractor’s broader platform and user account environment.

A11. A PIA will only be required from the successful Proponent. The “initiative” for purposes of the PIA refers to the City’s implementation and use of the proposed pay parking mobile payment solution, including any collection, storage, access, processing, or transmission of personal information associated with the services provided to the City. Proponents are not required to complete a PIA for their broader corporate platform or unrelated user account environments beyond the scope of the proposed services to the City.

Q12. The Proposal Submission Form allows proponents to either provide a completed PIA based on Appendix B or agree to cooperate with the development of one with the City. Please clarify what cooperation with the City would involve, including the expected timing, responsibilities, required inputs, review process, and whether the PIA would be completed before or after contract award.

A12. Cooperation with the City regarding development of the PIA would only be required from the successful Proponent. The process, timing, required inputs, and review requirements will be determined following contract award based on the proposed solution and the City’s internal privacy review processes. The successful Proponent will be expected to provide reasonable information and documentation related to the services being provided to support completion of the PIA.

Q13. Fair Signage Visibility: To ensure a fair and competitive multi-provider environment, will the City control and standardize all physical parking signage and decals? This standardization should ensure that all approved mobile applications receive identical branding footprint, QR code dimensions, and text visibility across all zones and pay station housings?

A13. Yes the City will ensure standardization of signage

Q14. Integration Cost Parameters: Section 5.2.a.iii states that the Contractor is responsible for all integration costs. Are there any connection, data-licensing, or transactional API fees charged by the City’s current enforcement hardware or software vendors to pass mobile payment data? If these third-party fees exist, is the proponent expected to absorb them?

A14. There are no additional connection, data-licensing, or transactional API fees charged by the City’s current enforcement hardware or software vendors to pass mobile payment data. The City’s current enforcement system, Genetec AMS includes “Pay-By-Plate Sync Multi” which allows the system to connect to multiple pay-by-plate end points.

Q15. Processing Fees under Model B (City as Merchant of Record): For Pricing Model B, where the City acts as the Merchant of Record using major processors like Moneris or Chase Paymentech, can the City confirm that it will absorb 100% of the credit card processing and interchange fees directly, meaning the contractor's user convenience fee will not be expected to subsidize the City's merchant processing costs?

A15. If the City elects to act as the Merchant of Record, the City would be responsible for merchant processing and interchange fees associated with payment transactions.

Q16. Credit Card Fees under Model A (Contractor as Merchant of Record): If the City selects Pricing Model A, where the Contractor acts as the Merchant of Record, is the contractor expected to absorb the baseline credit card processing and merchant gateway fees within the user-facing convenience fee, or will those credit card processing fees be passed through to the City as a separate operational cost?

A16. If the Proponent acts as the Merchant of Record, the Proponent shall include all merchant processing, interchange, gateway, and related transaction fees within its proposed pricing structure. Any user-facing convenience fees must be clearly identified in the Proposal.

Q17. Genetec ALPR. §5.2(a)(iii) requires integration with Genetec ALPR. Could the City confirm the specific Genetec product/edition in use (e.g., Security Center, AutoVu), the version, and whether the City already has an established integration pattern (REST API, plug-in, partner program) it expects Proponents to follow?

A17. The City is currently using Genetec AutoVu Managed Services (AMS) 5.13.3.6. This system uses a REST API service to access pay-by-plate information. For more information, Proponents can refer to the Genetec Development Acceleration Program (DAP) portal at <https://developer.genetec.com>.

Q18. FieldTicket. Could the City confirm the FieldTicket vendor/product and version, and whether an integration specification or sandbox is available to Proponents during evaluation or at award?

A18. As integration to FieldTicket is considered an added operational benefit and not a requirement, no integration specifications or sandbox will be made available at this time. Proponents are to describe if this integration is potentially available and if it has been provided to other clients.

Q19. Standardized zone structure. §5.2(c) refers to a standardized zone structure defined by the City. Has that schema already been defined, and if so, can a copy be shared with Proponents? If it is to be co-developed at award, could the City confirm the expected lead and timing?

A19. The standardized zone structure has not yet been defined and will be developed during implementation with the successful Proponent. The City's Transportation Division will lead this process.

Q20. Have any information meetings been scheduled?

A20. No information meetings are currently scheduled.

Q21. Is there a specific reason the RFP is only seeking digital payments and not a full parking solution inclusive of digital payments and physical pay stations?

A21. The scope of this RFP is limited to a digital pay parking mobile payment application. The City intends to issue a separate RFP for physical pay parking stations.

Q22. Can submission include an appendix with broader solution-based thinking and recommendations for the City, without penalty for non-requested information?

A22. Yes, Proponents may include supplementary information. However, Proponents should clearly identify and direct the City to the applicable appendix, section, or page references relevant to the requirements and evaluation criteria.

Q23. Is a key consideration by the City, continuity of parking technologies across the Tri-Cities? If yes, how and where is this being scored?

A23. It is not a key consideration and is instead a factor in the amount and variety of vendors selected to ensure that there is an opportunity for both regional and local parking payment app provider selection.

Q24. If convenience fees are charged per transaction, would the City be incurring this cost or would it be an itemized pass through cost to the parker?

A24. Single flat fee that encompasses all operating costs for all card types and presented to the customer prior to payment.

End of Addendum No. 2

Proponents take into account the content of this Addendum in the preparation and submission of the Proposal which will form part of the Contract and should be acknowledged on the Proposal Submission Form.

Upon submitting a Proposal, Proponents are deemed to have received all addenda that are issued and posted on the City's website and considered the information for inclusion in the Proposal Submission.

Issued by:

Chris Overes

Senior Procurement Specialist

bid@coquitlam.ca