

2026 Multifamily Software RFQ Questions and Responses

Date: May 21, 2026
To: Respondents to 2026 Multifamily Software RFQ
Subject: Responsive to questions from vendors regarding the 2026 Multifamily Software RFQ

Per Section III of the RFQ, all questions or requests for additional information submitted to MHDC regarding this RFQ and the corresponding answers will be published on MHDC’s website or otherwise made available to all Respondents. Below are the questions MHDC received from vendors regarding the 2026 Multifamily Software RFQ.

Question	RFQ Reference	MHDC Response
Preferred go-live timeline after June 12 recommendation? Deadline based on contract expiration or end-of-support date with an existing vendor?	Section II B, Scope of Services	Begin once vendor selected; complete implementation by June 30, 2027. MHDC will manage deadline based on project parameters negotiated with selected vendor.
Should repeated items (e.g., Training, Data Conversion) be answered in each section or only once?	Section II B, Scope of Services	Section IV 4. Each reference appears in a different context, so each requires its own response.
Should respondents assume all modules (Allocation, Construction Disbursement Management, Compliance, Inspections, PBV/Section 8, and Reporting) are in scope for Phase 1 pricing and implementation?	Section II B, Scope of Services	Yes, but MHDC may defer modules based on project parameters.
Clarify ‘installation of required hardware/software.’	Section II B, Project Management	Depending on the server and client requirements, Project Management should include management of any hardware or software that is needed for the solution to function. This would include third party software or any hardware required for a possible mobile solution.
Must software be hosted on-premises?	Section II B, Project Management	No requirement: hosting location will be determined by parameters of the project such as ease of implementation and budget.
Clarify which federal entities are included in this scope [mandatory changes to processes and calculations], and whether ADA compliance falls within the definition of mandatory changes?	Section II B, Functional Requirements	In addition to HUD and IRS, MHDC may interact with the US Treasury and other federal executive departments and entities as required for program administration. There may be additions and subtractions to this list based on Housing Finance Agency laws and regulations. MHDC expectation is that the selected vendor will monitor changes to policy and procedure and implement these changes as required with no additional cost to MHDC. This includes any federal and state ADA compliance requirements.

<p>Identify the two custom software packages currently in use and describe functions.</p>	<p>Section II B, Functional Requirements</p>	<p>MHDC uses Asset Management Reporting System (AMRS) and Data Portal. AMRS monitors financial compliance. AMRS is a .Net software application developed by MHDC. AMRS has a browser-based frontend with an SQL database that is used by Internal and External users. AMRS is hosted on premises with MHDC. Data Portal is a .Net application that was designed for tracking and monitoring Applications. This application has a browser-based frontend with a SQL database that is used internally. Data is input via SSIS and manually. This program is being deprecated once the functionality is replaced and the data is migrated.</p>
<p>Up to four MHDC-specific functionality requests are included in annual maintenance. Can MHDC provide examples of the types of requests it has historically made or anticipates needing on an annual basis? Understanding the nature and typical complexity of these requests will help respondents scope and price ongoing support accurately.</p>	<p>Section II B, Functional Requirements</p>	<p>Historically, MHDC has asked for additional data fields, additional columns in reports or other output, and possible import or export functions. MHDC does not anticipate needing 4 per year and does not assume that these requests will roll over or cumulate if not required. MHDC has not required any specific functionality changes for some years and 4-6 functionality changes for other years. This need is driven by legal and process changes.</p>
<p>Provide additional details on the Missouri Eligibility Statement (MOST), including its format, content, frequency and intended purpose.</p>	<p>Section II B, Software Capabilities – Allocation</p>	<p>MOST is used for State LIHTC allocations, similar to the IRS 8609; created each time a property receives State LIHTC. See Exhibit 1 below for a copy of the MOST form.</p>
<p>Describe desired structure/content of Disbursement Schedule.</p>	<p>Section II B, Software Capabilities – Construction Disbursement Management</p>	<p>All new construction that receives a Construction Loan through MHDC as part of funding has a disbursement schedule, currently tracked in Excel. This schedule includes amount allocated, monthly drawdowns, past drawdowns, and remaining balances of expenses and sources (including adjustments to the original allocation).</p>
<p>Provide additional details on the contractor advance tracking requirements, including the data points and workflow expected.</p>	<p>Section II B, Software Capabilities – Construction Disbursement Management</p>	<p>Contractor Advance is separate tracking for itemized Construction hard costs. This total is rolled into the Disbursement Schedule.</p>
<p>Clarify the specific functionality and use case envisioned for the Project Based Vouchers (PBV) flag?</p>	<p>Section II B, Software Capabilities-Compliance</p>	<p>MHDC is the Performance Based Contract Administrator (PBCA) that administers funds for Project Based Section 8 in Missouri. The PBV flag would be a Boolean field to track whether a property falls under Performance Based Contract Administration.</p>
<p>Share the specific requirements and expected scope for the IDIS integration for HOME. Is the IDIS integration for HOME a hard requirement, or is it truly "preferred" as noted in the RFQ? Will proposals that do not include a native IDIS integration be scored down, or is a documented integration roadmap acceptable?</p>	<p>Section II B, Software Capabilities – Integration</p>	<p>IDIS is software specific to HUD funding. MHDC does not have a current IDIS implementation. This implementation is preferred and lack of integration will not be primary reason for non-selection of vendor. Any integration for IDIS will be vendor driven.</p>

What is MHDC's preferred approach to integration development?	Section II B, Software Capabilities – Integration	MHDC prefers to be hands-on when possible. MHDC's preference is to collaborate with the vendor. MHDC will build data sets if possible or facilitate vendor access to the data so that the vendor can build the data sets.
Is AMRS for internal or external use?	Section II B, Software Capabilities – Integration	AMRS is internal and external reporting and input. AMRS is used by internal and external users to track and monitor financial compliance.
If a vendor's platform natively handles online application submission and all related allocation workflows end-to-end, would MAAP integration still be required? Or is MAAP used for purposes beyond application intake that would necessitate ongoing integration regardless of vendor capability?	Section II B, Software Capabilities – Integration	Application capability is part of this RFQ, and vendor capability should be included in the response. MAAP has been developed by MHDC, and integration would be primarily data driven. MHDC needs and vendor capability will determine how integration will be handled.
What specific functions does MAAP currently perform that MHDC anticipates retaining post-implementation, and which functions would MHDC expect to migrate into the new system?	Section II B, Software Capabilities – Integration	The Application module is considered Phase 2 implementation; the functionality is not yet determined.
Can MHDC share the approximate tenant count and voucher volume to help respondents scope the Section 50058 module accurately?	Section II B, Software Capabilities – PBV	MHDC administers Project Based Section 8 as the Performance Based Contact Administrator. There are currently 348 properties in our portfolio.
Is RACS submission currently handled in-house or through a third-party administrator?	Section II B, Software Capabilities – PBV	This is handled internally by MHDC.
Which dashboard/reporting platforms should be integrated?	Section II B, Software Capabilities – Reporting	Reporting needs are dynamic; integrated dashboards would be SQL-based.
Identify required HUD/IRS reports.	Section II B, Software Capabilities – Reporting	Required federal reports include IRS 8609, 8610, 8823, 1099, W9; and HUD reporting for LIHTC tenants/properties that have been placed in service or removed. Report formats are often via Excel or XML.
Is the Application module expected to be included in initial pricing, or should respondents' scope and price it separately?	Section II B, Software Capabilities – Application	MHDC would like the Application module scoped as part of the initial pricing. The response should also include a module price if MHDC chooses to move forward without the Application module or to defer the Application module to a later fiscal year.
The RFQ requires five complimentary conference registrations upon implementation and two per year thereafter. Which conference is MHDC referring to?	Section II B, Costs	Only applies to vendor sponsored user conferences, if applicable.
Will references be contacted before or after shortlisting?	Section IV, Structure of Proposal	References can be contacted after any review of RFQ responses, recommendations of vendors to the committee, and during the initial negotiations with the selected vendor.
Are shortlisted respondents expected to provide a live system demonstration? If so, will MHDC provide a scripted scenario or demo script to ensure consistency across respondents?	Section VII, Evaluation Criteria	Any RFQ respondent can be asked to provide a demo. MHDC does not provide a script. However, MHDC would draft an outline of functionality based on the RFQ and the response.
Will MHDC share the relative weighting of evaluation criteria (e.g., cost, functionality, references, implementation approach)?	Section VII, Evaluation Criteria	All aspects of the RFQ are evaluated equally. Due to the complexity of the request, MHDC understands that not all responses will have all requested functionality.

Exhibit 1: Copy of the Missouri Eligibility Statement (MOST)

