



## NOTICE TO ALL FIRMS

Date: March 24, 2026  
To: All Prospective Bidders  
From: Sam Li  
Director of Procurement Services  
Re: Addendum Number 2  
IFB # C1630 – Investment Management and Related Services

### Questions

- Q1. What is the intended engagement model? Is FIT seeking:
- a) A discretionary investment manager (OCIO/full discretion)
  - b) A non-discretionary advisor/consultant, or
  - c) A hybrid model (e.g., discretion within poly ranges, committee approval for major changes)?
- A1. The RFP contemplates an investment management engagement consistent with the Scope of Services described in the RFP and Investment Policy Statement (“IPS”). Respondents may propose a discretionary, non-discretionary, or hybrid model consistent with the Policy and governance framework.
- Q2. Who has final decision for asset allocation, manager selection, and implementation?
- A2. The RFP contemplates an investment management engagement consistent with the Scope of Services described in the RFP and Investment Policy Statement (“IPS”). Respondents may propose a discretionary, non-discretionary, or hybrid model consistent with the Policy and governance framework.
- Q3. Is the Advisory expected to be the investment manager of record (IMR) for public markets trading, including brokerage selection, or will trading be conducted by underlying manager/custodian?
- A3. Trading responsibilities will be determined based on the engagement model proposed and accepted. Respondents should describe their standard approach.
- Q4. Is the RFP award intended to cover only FIT Foundation assets (~\$74M) or additional entities? If it includes other entities, please provide asset sizes, objectives, liquidity needs, restrictions, and whether they will be part of the same contract and fee schedule.
- A4. The RFP is issued on behalf of the FIT Foundation and currently relates to approximately \$74 million in Foundation assets. No additional entities are included at this time.

- Q5. Are cash management/deposits part of the scope? These objective includes “manage its deposits” and provide “other related financial services,” which implies banking/treasury services. Please confirm whether this includes banking services.
- A5. Traditional banking or treasury services are not part of the core scope unless explicitly proposed and accepted by FIT. Respondents should refer to the RFP Scope of Services.
- Q6. If the Advisor proposes tiered breakpoints (common in institutional pricing), is that allowed? AUM-based pricing typically scales. Please confirm.
- A6. Tiered or breakpoint pricing structures will be considered provided the proposal is clear and transparent.
- Q7. Confirm required reporting cadence and “who receives what.” Policy references CFO and College Controller monthly statements within 15 days; RFP scope requires monthly reporting. Please confirm recipients, formats, and whether data files (e.g., holdings, transactions) are required for reconciliation.
- A7. Reporting requirements are outlined in the RFP and IPS. Respondents may describe standard reporting practices consistent with those documents.
- Q8. Please provide current benchmarks or desired benchmark approach for evaluation consistency.
- A8. Benchmarking guidance is provided in the IPS. Respondents may propose an evaluation framework consistent with the Policy.
- Q9. Should returns be time-weighted, money-weighted, or both? Are there specific requirements for private investments (IRR, PME, DPI/RVIP/TVPI)?
- A9. Performance measurement expectations are addressed in the RFP and IPS. Respondents may describe standard industry practices.
- Q10. Please reconcile the “foreign issuers prohibited” statement with the explicit EAFE/EM targets and existing international equity holdings. Are international equities permitted via CITs/mutual funds/ADRs only, or is the prohibition outdated/limited in scope?
- A10. The IPS governs permitted investments. Respondents should interpret all provisions in their broader Policy context.
- Q11. Are Policy targets/ranges applicable to both “current” and “endowed” portfolios, or can they differ? The policy says Finance Committee may select different strategies separately for current and endowed portfolios. Please confirm current targets/ranges per pool.
- A11. Asset allocation targets and ranges are governed by the IPS. The Finance Committee retains discretion as described therein.
- Q12. What is the current policy compliance status (as of most recent quarter)? Are there any known guideline exceptions (e.g., alternatives range, illiquids, “Level 3” exposer) that the incoming advisor is expected to remediate?

- A12. The portfolio is generally managed in accordance with the IPS. No additional remediation expectations are being prescribed through this RFP.
- Q13. How does FIT define “Level 3 investments” for purposes of prohibition? Does this restriction apply only to direct holdings (e.g., direct private placements) and not commingled funds, or does it require explicit approval for PE/VC funds?
- A13. Definitions and restrictions related to Level 3 investments are governed by the IPS.
- Q14. Are private investments expected to continue (10% target) and are new commitments anticipated?
- A14. Private investment parameters are addressed in the IPS. No new commitments are being mandated through this RFP.
- Q15. What is the current spending rule actually applied (trailing average, market value, smoothing period)? The financial statement states “spending policy...4.5% of the endowment,” while the Policy references a range and administrative component. Please confirm methodology and whether the advisor is expected to model spending sustainability (CPI+ objective)
- A15. The spending policy is governed by the IPS and financial statements. Respondents should assume the current policy remains in effect.
- Q16. What are the expected annual cash flows? Please provide: annual draw targets, scholarship payout timing, operating transfers, capital projects needs, and whether there are near-term liquidity events (e.g., planned spending step-ups).
- A16. Cash flow expectations are consistent with historical spending and current policy. No extraordinary liquidity needs are being disclosed.
- Q17. How is “current portfolio” used vs. “endowed portfolio”? Are there separate objectives and liquidity constraints? Are both within the \$74M investment total?
- A17. Portfolio structure and objectives are described in the IPS.
- Q18. Are there donor restrictions or sub-fund level constraints that affect asset allocation (e.g., fund-by-fund)? With 357 endowment funds, implementation may require pooled accounting or unitization mechanics. Please describe current structure and whether the manager must provide sub-fund accounting support.
- A18. Donor restrictions exist and are managed within the Foundation’s structure. The RFP does not require the Advisor to perform sub-fund accounting unless otherwise proposed and agreed.
- Q19. Does FIT currently have an active commission recapture program/provider? If yes: who is the vendor, what is the target, and is directed brokerage mandatory?
- A19. No specific commission recapture program requirements are being prescribed at this time.
- Q20. Are diverse broker-dealer utilization goals defined (targets, reporting format)? The RFP references minority-owned/diverse broker-dealers and goals, but doesn’t specify metrics. Please provide expectations.

- A20. Expectations are described at a principles level in the RFP. Firms should describe their general approach.
- Q21. Please confirm whether any derivative overlays are acceptable and under what governance/approval process.
- A21. Use of derivatives is governed by the IPS and subject to approval.
- Q22. Does FIT currently have specific ESG restrictions, screens, or priority themes? If yes, please list prohibited sectors/regions/behaviors and the approval process for changes.
- A22. ESG considerations are addressed in the IPS. No additional restrictions beyond those stated are currently in effect.
- Q23. Does FIT require proxy voting aligned to FIT-specific guidelines, or is manager policy acceptable?
- A23. Manager proxy voting policies are acceptable unless otherwise required by FIT.
- Q24. Would FIT want to understand our Proxy voting services?
- A24. Firms may describe proxy voting services as part of their response.
- Q25. Who is the current custodian and what systems are used for accounting and reporting?
- A25. Custodial relationships are in place. Respondents should assume standard institutional custodial and reporting systems.
- Q26. Will FIT require the selected Advisor to provide transition management services, or will FIT appoint a transition manager separately?
- A26. Transition management will be addressed if needed following selection.
- Q27. Are there any lock-ups, gates, or redemption notice periods that affect transition timing? Please provide a full liquidity schedule.
- A27. Liquidity constraints are consistent with the IPS and existing investment structures.
- Q28. What prompted the Foundation to initiate this RFP process at this time?
- A28. The RFP is part of the Foundation's regular governance and review process.
- Q29. Are there specific areas where the Committee is seeking change (performance, service model, fees, reporting, alternatives access)?
- A29. Respondents should focus on delivering strong performance, service, reporting, and value consistent with the RFP.
- Q30. Please confirm whether the Foundation is considering firms to provide services under a discretionary OCIO model.

- A30. Proposals may include services consistent with the RFP.
- Q31. Are there formal ESG, mission-aligned, or exclusionary investment guidelines in place that are not reflected in the current Investment Policy Statement?
- A31. No additional guidelines beyond those in the IPS.
- Q32. What are the anticipated net cash flow needs (spending, capital projects, strategic initiatives) over the next 12-24 months?
- A32. Cash flow needs are consistent with current operations and spending policy.
- Q33. The RFP references submission of a fixed percent fee on the Proposal Analysis Sheet. Our standard practice is to utilize an asset-based fee schedule that may include breakpoints as assets grow. For evaluation purposes, is a tiered asset-based schedule acceptable?
- A33. Yes, tiered asset-based fee schedules are acceptable for evaluation purposes.
- Q34. In the RFP, you noted that the ultimate contracting entity would be the FIT Foundation (a 501(C)(3) organization). There are references to other entities on page 2, and we would like to confirm that the contracting entity would be the FIT Foundation only, and not any of the other public organizations references.
- A34. The contracting entity will be the FIT Foundation.
- Q35. Is the current advisor providing discretionary investment management (OCIO), and is this the model FIT intends to continue?
- A35. The current engagement model is consistent with the IPS. Respondents should propose their independent approach.
- Q36. What aspects of the current advisory relationship would you most like to improve?
- A36. The RFP reflects the Foundation's priorities for this review.
- Q37. What are FIT's top strategic priorities over the next 5-10 years?
- A37. Prudent stewardship, financial sustainability, and governance best practices.
- Q38. The Investment Policy references an 8% inflation-adjusted return objective (page 3), while spending is stated at 4.5%-5.5% inclusive of a 0.5% administrative fee (page 6). Can you confirm that the total return target remains 8%?
- A38. The total return objective is as stated in the IPS.
- Q39. Are there major capital projects or initiatives expected to impact liquidity?
- A39. No.
- Q40. Do you require 3<sup>rd</sup> party reporting for endowment sub-accounts?

A40. Not required unless otherwise agreed.

Q41. Can you share the Committee's perspective/recent discussions regarding active/passive investing?

A41. The Foundation remains open to approaches consistent with the IPS.

Q42. Would you be able to provide a statement of current holdings? If not, can you provide additional detail on private and alternative investments, including:

- Total exposure to illiquid investments (private equity, private credit, real estate, infrastructure, and real assets)
- Current market value
- Remaining unfunded commitments

A42. Not provided at this stage.

Q43. What level of short-term drawdown is acceptable in pursuit of long-term objectives?

A43. Risk tolerance is governed by the IPS.

Q44. Are there asset classes or structures FIT prefers to avoid?

A44. Refer to the IPS.

Q45. Which risk scenarios are most concerning (inflation, recession, enrollment pressure)?

A45. Firms should address standard institutional risk considerations.

Q46. Does FIT incorporate any specific ESG, sustainability or mission-based screens into their current investments?

A46. Refer to the IPS.

Q47. Are there particular areas FIT seeks to avoid or emphasize (e.g., human rights, environmental considerations, social equity)?

A47. No additional guidance beyond the IPS.

Q48. Are any refinancing, paydowns, or new borrowing initiatives anticipated?

A48. None currently anticipated.

Q49. Are there existing managers or mandates you prefer to retain if an advisor change occurs?

A49. No assurances regarding retention of existing managers are being made.

Q50. Are there any liquidity constraints we should be aware of?

A50. As described in the IPS.

Q51. We would like to learn more about FIT's strategic priorities for the current environment. How would you describe the priorities that your board and leadership team are focused on (e.g., strategic planning; board recruitment and education; diversifying revenue streams; continued expansion of your fundraising/development strategy including the inclusion of complex assets, DAFs, QCDs, split-interest trusts, bequests, etc.)?

A51. Prudent stewardship, financial sustainability, and governance best practices.

Q52. Are there any specific reasons why you are going to RFP?

A52. The RFP is part of the Foundation's regular governance and review process.

Q53. Who is the incumbent?

A53. Custodial relationships are in place. Respondents should assume standard institutional custodial and reporting systems.

Q54. What additional "other related financial services" would you anticipate?

A54. As may be proposed and evaluated per the RFP.

Q55. What percentage of the operating budget is funded by the Foundation?

A55. Foundation support for the operating budget varies annually based on spending policy, operating needs, donor restrictions, and market conditions and is not a fixed percentage.

Q56. Is there a need for plan allocation (fund accounting)? How many accounts?

A56. Not required beyond standard reporting unless otherwise agreed.

Q57. Does the portfolio currently include dedicated ESG fund investments?

A57. Refer to the IPS.

Q58. Regarding performance data, what is your preferred end date and how far back should the performance data be? Does you prefer annualized data, calendar year data, or both?

A58. Standard institutional presentation formats are acceptable.

Q59. Are you the current trustee for your existing CRTs?

A59. Not applicable to this RFP.

Q60. What has motivated the insurance of the RFP at this time? Is it due to the current contract expiring or are there other motivations?

A60. The RFP is part of the Foundation's regular governance and review process.

Q61. Has the incumbent been invited to participate?

A61. Yes.

Q62. Are there specific areas – performance, service, fees, etc. – where you are seeking improvement?

A62. Refer to the RFP objectives.

Q63. Are there any additional services or resources not provided by your current advisor that you are seeking to add?

A63. As may be proposed and evaluated per the RFP.

Q64. If possible, please provide a current statement of allocation & holdings.

A64. Not provided at this stage.

Q65. If possible, please share the current fee structure.

A65. Consistent with its fiduciary responsibilities as a public institution, FIT will evaluate fee proposals independently based on competitiveness, clarity, and overall value to preserve a fair and competitive procurement process.

Q66. How is the spending policy calculated? Is it based on portfolio value at a specific date or is it averaged over multiple periods of time?

A66. As described in the IPS.

Q67. The RFP refers to responsible investing. Are you currently utilizing any ESG strategies or mission & values aligned investment strategies in the portfolio?

A67. Refer to the IPS.

**THIS ADDENDUM IS PART OF THE CONTRACT DOCUMENT AND SHALL BE INCLUDED WITH YOUR REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL. YOUR SIGNATURE BELOW WARRANTS THAT YOU UNDERSTAND THIS ADDENDUM AND THAT YOU HAVE MADE THE APPROPRIATE ADJUSTMENTS IN YOUR PROPOSAL AND CALCULATIONS.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Print Name and Title of Authorized Representative

\_\_\_\_\_  
Print Name of Company/Partnership/Individual

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date