



RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS

CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

ADDENDUM #4

DATE: 10/4/2018

RFO#: 455-18-9003

TITLE: INSPECTION ENFORCEMENT TRACKING AND REPORTING SERVICES

PROPOSAL DEADLINE: TUESDAY OCTOBER 16, 2018 AT 3:00 PM CT

ADDENDUM ITEM #4:

Purpose of this Addendum is to publicize submitted questions with answers.

No.	QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
1	What is that States budget?	The RRC expects the vendor community to provide a reasonable price that meets the objectives of this solicitation.
2	Is the 100% proposal bond mandatory?	Yes
3	Are there APIs or integration programs already in place that are currently interfacing with the following RRC existing/legacy systems? a. IBM Mainframe b. ESRI ArcGIS c. Oracle GIS d. IMS e. Oracle Open Systems	Not for all cases. RRC has standards and APIs for existing solutions that can be reused for this effort.
4	The RRC architecture diagram provided in the RFP depicts that the Imaging and Content Management System is outside of the RRC intranet. Where is the Imaging and Content Management System currently hosted?	The RRC expects the vendor community to provide a solution that meets the objectives of this solicitation. If that solution requires the case management system to be hosted outside RRC/DCS current infrastructure, the vendor should propose the location.
5	With respect to the Case Management – General Features; “#19. The product will allow a user to generate case, docket, hearing and conference documents.”, does RRC have a document format preference when generating documents (e.g. PDF)?	As long as this is not a proprietary format, RRC will work with the respondent on this.
6	With respect to the Case Management – General Features; “#31. The product will allow a user to delete a case in certain circumstances (tdb).”, does RRC have a preferred deletion-type for the platform to support (e.g. “hard-delete”	Not preferred. This should be defined as part of the analysis activities.

	case and its related components entirely from database, or “soft-delete” case to hide case from user interfaces but still remains in database for audit trail)?	
7	With respect to the Case Management – Conference Features; “#45. The product will allow user to generate conference agenda in MS Word.”, is RRC open to standardizing the process by having the platform allow users to generate conference agendas using a self-service feature (via a web-based form/template), which would capture conference details and export to PDF or Word?	Yes
8	With respect to the Case Management – External Secured Portal Features; “#61. The secure portal will provide the ability to submit payment of fees, penalties, and reimbursements for a case (integration with RRC SYSTEMS).”, does RRC expect the proposed platform to provide e-Commerce/e-Payment gateway features to process financial transactions and transfer relevant payment information to RRC systems? Or, will payment-financial transactions be executed by the existing RRC systems?	Payment-financial transactions will be executed using the state service provider for online transactions. The system needs to integrate with the providers solution.
9	Section 2.2 & 2.4.1 Standard & Security Requirements: 1. Inspection Management System does require scheduling and also an application that can be used at the field to track and file cases during inspection. What else should the functionality of a field level service application possess? 2. How many users are we looking at using the system as such on a whole 3. Will there be any external users, participating in any of the functions who will need access apart from the internal RRC employees? If yes then can you please elaborate the breadth of the user base?	What else should the functionality of a field level service application possess?: This can be defined as part of the analysis activities. How many users are we looking at using the system as such on a whole: under 500 RRC users with various levels of access. Will there be any external users, participating in any of the functions who will need access apart from the internal RRC employees? If yes then can you please elaborate the breadth of the user base?: This system is intended to provide access to case information to the citizens of Texas. In addition, parties/representatives (as defined in the Business Process Mapping of RRC Case and Docket Management Processes documentation) will have the ability to interact with the system beyond reporting and searching capabilities.
10	Section 2.4.1 Standards and Security Requirements: The requirement states that the "Vendor shall provide a description of security approaches as part of their Technical Approach (see Attachment 2). Per the RFO definitions, should this say Respondent?	Yes.
11	Section 2.4.5 Service locations: Does this restrict that the Vendor project team sits in a specific Client location only or can they be spread out across US?	Vendor project team is expected to be in RRC locations for critical project activities. And within the contiguous United States for non-critical activities (see section 2.4.5).
12	Section 2.5.5 Transition Plan and Maintenance Support: Is the transition plan due with the proposal or is this a post-award activity? The section begins with "the Respondent" but transitions to "the Vendor".	The transition plan is due with the proposal
13	Section 2.5.5 Transition Plan & Maintenance Support: 1. Is this going to be 1-2 weeks of Production support or long term?	1. This is for respondent to propose and RRC to consider

	<p>2. Since this project would have to be delivered in different phases, is there an expectations that we deliver one transition plan for each phase?</p> <p>3. Also, while one phase is already into production, what level of support would be needed or what is the expectation of deliverables during this period from us?</p> <p>4. Would there be enhancement requests or change requests that we would need to consider during the warranty support period</p> <p>5. A post production/warranty support: would these be goverend or managed by us or would it be a collaborative effrot and if so what would be expectation?</p>	<p>2. there is no expectation for one way or another</p> <p>3. This will depend on the respondent's proposal for maintenance and support.</p> <p>4. Possibly</p> <p>5.Respondents are expected to propose the model that works best for the solution implemented.</p>
14	<p>Section 2.5.6.4 RRC does not expect data migration activities to be a part of the work to be accomplished in this biennium.:</p> <p>1. We might have to include data migration for existing customer data or historical data for the system to be used?</p> <p>2.What is the mode of Data load - batch or one time load!</p> <p>3. Any static data sets that might need to be loaded to support day to day activities when the application goes live?</p>	<p>RRC does not expect data migration activities to be a part of the work to be accomplished in this biennium</p>
15	<p>Section 2.5.6.4 Roles & Responsibilities:</p> <p>Develop Integrations to RRC Systems</p> <p>Implement integrations to RRC systems:</p> <p>1. What is the potential volume of data we are looking at bringing through integration touch points into Salesforce?</p> <p>2. Nature of Integration: Real -Time or Nightly?</p> <p>3. Do you have an existing integration tool that would want to be used?</p> <p>4. Any Data Compliance or level of Security needed for the data flowing in or out of the system?</p> <p>5. The current integration systems should be able to expose their services to be consumed by the new application that is being implemented</p>	<p>System integrations will be required to be secure in nature with solutions being presented by Respondents. All integrations solutions should be scalable, accessible, flexible and timely based on solutions to be presented by Respondent.</p> <p>Specifics on data volumes will be defined during the analysis activities.</p>
16	<p>Section 2.5.6.5 Enter defects (into defect tracking system) found during UAT:</p> <p>Is there a specific Defect Tracking tool that we need to use owned and maintained by RRC or would that tool be managed by vendor?</p>	<p>RRC uses Jira for defect tracking.</p>
17	<p>Section 2.5.6.7 Deployment:</p> <p>The Release Management Planning and the Release Calender: would this be something driven by RRC or would this be something that NTT decided and RRC reviews and approves the Release Calender? The reason being we might have multiple phase wise work going on & that might need multiple releases</p>	<p>Vendor proposes release calendar and RRC reviews and approves</p>
18	<p>Section 2.5.7 Acceptance Criteria: All deliverables shall have deliverable acceptance criteria and a time period for review and/or testing specified through collaboration between the Vendor and RRC, and finalized within the Contract and Work Plan:</p> <p>Is there a standard approval time frame we are looking at which should be accounted since this will impact the timeliness and planning in our estimations</p>	<p>Respondents can/should define these timeframes in their response.</p>

19	<p>Section 3.3 Current Technology Environment:</p> <p>1. Does this project scope include NTT analysing these current system along with RRC team and document or capture all that needs to be replicated or that which needs to be excluded from the new implmentaiton?</p> <p>2. What is the plan of phasing out these systems: System dependencies and logical grouping might need to align with how these systems are integrated and how each phase should be logically grouped and released to ensure an end-end flow:</p>	<p>1. Yes. Although RRC has done some high level analysis</p> <p>2. these logical groupings can be either proposed in the response, or defined throughout the implementation, as long as the respondents describe how these phases will be defined.</p>
20	<p>Section 4.1 The primary areas in scope for this biennium include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Docket creation and management, • Work assignment and tracking, • Report generation, • Hearing scheduling and management, • Searchable public access to inspection, violation, and docket data, and • Online filing of compliance information and case-related documents (if possible).: <p>Is there a diagramatic representation of which system is handling what functions in your current day's environment?</p>	<p>No. All applicable documentation was attached to the RFO</p>
21	<p>Section 1.1 Future “To-Be” Case/Docket Management Process:</p> <p>All the actors mentioned in the different flow diagrams in the Appendix section for Case Management and docket systems implementation(Furture State) - are they all employees of RRC or do we have external participants also being actors?</p>	<p>External participants are also actors</p>
22	<p>External Secured Portal Features</p> <p>Public Portal Features:</p> <p>What kind of users base are looking at and how many users are we looking at?</p> <p>Our understanding that these portals will also serve as modes of creating cases and inspection records in the system right?</p>	<p>1. See answers to questions 32, 33 and 34.</p> <p>2. No.</p>
23	<p>Generated Documents:</p> <p>There are references that these documents should be generated into PDF, MS word and some of them into csv. Should these be sent vis emails and email notifications as attachment to specific users and</p> <p>Are Electronic signatures a req?</p>	<p>1. Yes.</p> <p>2. Need additional clarifications to answer the electronic signature requirement question.</p>
24	<p>Section 1.8.3.2 A Hearing Request Letter is prepared and sent to the parties. A response deadline is provided with the Hearing Request Letter:</p> <p>: Is this a system generated letter or a manual one and sent manually?</p>	<p>If possible, system generated.</p>
25	<p>Section 1.8.4.1 A Notice of Hearing (NOH) is prepared and sent to the requestor and the parties on the case’s service list.:</p> <p>Is this going to be an email notification?</p>	<p>Yes. This will be defined as part of the analysis activities</p>
26	<p>Sections 1.2.4.8 & 1.2.10 Collect payment, Collect fees, penalties, settlement amounts (as applicable):</p> <p>Should we enable the system to process the payments as well? Need more details on this flow</p>	<p>See answer to question 8.</p>

27	Section 1.8.4.2 Parties to the case may submit pleadings until the deadline specified in the NOH.: what is the mode in which the parties would submit pleadings online or paperform and is it expected to be saved manually in the system for that specific case?	We expect the system to provide for both online and paper filings.
28	Section 1.8.6.5 For protested cases, the examiners prepare a Proposal for Decision (PFD) and proposed Final Order that are sent to the parties on the service list: is this system generated and sent via emails? All notices to be sent and responses to be received throughout the process - should this be enabled in the system where email notifications are sent to the parties involved and they send and receive online notices?	This can be defined as part of the analysis activities
29	Section 0.2.2 View of the Inspection, viewing the contact and documenting Inspection results: Should this be available offline or would the Inspector come back and document the results? What level of Online capabilities are we looking at or would this be an item to be explored at a later stage	Available offline
30	A variety of documents can be attached to a case throughout its life. Examples include (but are not limited to): Audio and video files: can these be public accessible on social sites? Are they supposed to be played within the Salesforce UI? What is the average size of the videos/audio files? Total no of audio or video files anticipated? What is the Imaging/content management application being used today?	1. likely not accessible on social sites 2. not required 3. unknown at this time 4. unknown at this time 5. neubus, but it is primarily used for imaging storage purposes.
31	Document Generation Questions: How many of these Documents will have static information? Does the page structure change frequently or would this be based on pre-defined templates	This will be defined as part of the analysis activities
32	Section 2.5.4 P12 refers to total of 240 inspectors: What is expected growth of inspector count over next 5 years?	Under 20%
33	Section 2.5.4 General: How many RRC employees exclusive of the 240 inspectors will need access to the Inspection Management system? Please provide breakdown of user counts for: 1) admin staff, 2) compliance manager, 3) reviewer, 4) incident or complaint intake staff, and 5) read-only users.	1) admin staff <50 2) compliance manager <50 3) reviewer <50 4) incident or complaint intake staff <50 5) read-only users <500
34	Section 2.5.3 General: Please provide a breakdown of users counts that will need access to the Case Management system for: 1) admin staff, 2) compliance staff, 3) technical reviewer, 4) management, 5) attorney and legal assistants, 6) docket services, 7) hearings examiner, 8) inspectors, 9) staff examiners	1) admin staff <25 2) compliance staff <25 3) technical reviewer <25 4) management <25 5) attorney and legal assistants <25 6) docket services <25 7) hearings examiner <25 8) inspectors <300 9) staff examiners <25
35	Attachment 15, item 1.1.1 What actors can initiate a case in the Case Management system? Are these always internal RRC resources or could this be external also? If so, please explain.	This information can be found throughout the entire Business Process Mapping of RRC Case and Docket Management Processes documentation (and more specifically in sections 2.2.1 Create Case and 2.3 User Roles).

36	Attachment 2, Public Portal Features: How many "external parties" will need access to the Case Management portal?	This system is intended to provide access to case information to the citizens of Texas. In addition, parties/representatives (as defined in the Business Process Mapping of RRC Case and Docket Management Processes documentation) will have the ability to interact with the system beyond reporting and searching capabilities.
37	Attachment 2, item 63: How will portal user find a case? Are all cases and details accessible by everyone in public or how to prevent certain portal users from accessing cases they are not able to access?	Not ALL cases and details should be accessible to everyone throughout the process. RRC expects respondents to propose a technical solution and a product that is able to accommodate for these needs. Reference sections 2.6 Queries and Searches for additional info on the types of information expected to be made available through the proposed solution.
38	2.6.3. Service Level Agreement (SLA). As part of Vendor's Service Level Agreement (SLA), the implemented solution must provide a fully redundant environment with a guaranteed service uptime of 99.95%.: Cloud Services Provider (CSP) uses commercially reasonable efforts to make its on-demand services available to its customers 24/7, except for planned downtime, for which the CSP gives customers prior notice, and force majeure events. While availability SLAs can be negotiated in a contract, the calculation is measured quarterly and not monthly. Can the RRC please adjust this requirement and specify that the SLA requirements can be negotiated based on the Service provider chosen?	No
39	If I may ask, concerning your statement that no remote work shall be conducted outside of the contiguous United States (2.4.5 Service Locations found on page 10).: Why is the State restricting the work location to just the US? Would the State consider allowing remote work to be performed in Canada, with prior approvals, with a similar guarantee that the State's data never leaves the Contiguous US with appropriate security and privacy controls?	See section 2.45.
38	Based on the roles on pages 169-171 and page 227, can you estimate how many users will need access to case data through the web portal?	See answers to questions 32, 33 and 34.
39	Can you estimate the number of internal users of the system?	See answers to questions 32, 33 and 34.
40	Is RRC satisfied with the current web portal interface and its ability to meet external user requirements? If so, would RRC consider leaving the current portal in place and interfacing to a new case management and inspection solution? If yes, does RRC IT have access (edit rights) to the source pages of the current web portal that the vendor could either modify or work with RRC to modify (light modifications)?	1.yes 2.yes 3.yes RRC considers this is not material to the objectives of the project.
41	Is there a requirement to migrate any legacy documents and cases from the existing system to the new one or is the system intended to manage only new cases going forward?	1.The Case Management system intended to manage only new cases going forward, but vendors should provide a plan and pricing for data migration activities,

	If legacy migration is required, can you provide quantities/volumes and any additional details?	should this be something the RRC seeks to include in the second biennium. 2. This will be defined as part of the analysis activities, but current case data is stored in the mainframe.
42	COTS Case management solutions typically include a document management and imaging sub-system to manage the case documents. this approach has many benefits including tight integration of case data with supporting documents, tight MS Office integration, integrated version management, integrated access control, integrated search, etc. Was RRC's intention to use the existing Imaging and Content Management system or can the vendor incorporate the imaging and document management solution that is part of their case management system? What imaging and content management system is currently used by RRC?	1.The vendor can incorporate the imaging and document management solution that is part of their case management system. 2.Neubus
43	Is there a requirement to put in place capabilities to capture paper documents with the new solution or will RRC use existing document scanners? If using existing document scanners, can you provide additional details on models and number of scanners?	This will be defined as part of the analysis activities
44	Can you provide additional details on inspection documents? Are there existing forms/document templates used to generate inspection reports - how many? Would RRC like these to be electronic forms/document templates completed in the field by inspectors? What hardware - i.e., tablets, laptops?	The attached inspection process provides this information The RRC field inspectors use a combination of Toughbook and Laptops
45	Can RRC estimate the number of different reports that would be required for the solution and provide any additional details on the types of reports?	This will be defined as part of the analysis activities
46	Regarding pricing on page 69, if the vendor is planning on proposing a cloud hosted solution, there would typically be monthly charges for the servers and hosting environment. The RFP is requesting pricing for hardware acquisition and life cycle support. Is it acceptable to provide cloud hosting monthly charges that include hardware and storage in lieu of actual hardware pricing?	Yes
47	Can you estimate how many users/months will need access to case data through the 'External Secured Portal'? (page 207 of the RFP)	See answers to questions 32, 33 and 34.
48	Can we assume that all documents (case summary, agenda, notebooks, motions, filings, transcripts, letters, notices, orders, rulings, etc.) associated with any pre-hearings, hearings, results should be stored in the document management component of the case management system?	Yes
49	Will the pre-hearing/hearing process use the system to provide access to documents/data stored in the case management system in real time?	Yes, probably
50	Does RRC prefer a vendor hosted solution or a DIR hosted solution?	RRC is looking for the solution that provides the best value for the state
51	If the vendor proposes a vendor hosted solution, are there methods available for connecting to existing RRC systems? (i.e. for consuming, sharing and exchanging information) What facilities are available to connect to existing RRC systems - i.e., will the Weblogic App Server	1.Yes. this is for the vendor to propose a solution and RRC to approve. 2. Yes 3. All data access and transfers need to be completed in a secure manner (both transport and application level)

	(diagram on page 118) be available to the vendor's proposed solution to use as a method to access internal RRC systems/databases? Can this be accessed outside the RRC firewall from an externally hosted solution? Or would this access need to occur through the existing Apache Web Server (in DMZ) using a web services model?	proposed by the respondent which integrates with RRC existing systems as necessary.
52	Regarding the 149 case types listed on page 11 under 2.5.3, can you provide a listing of the different case types?	The Business Process Mapping of RRC Case and Docket Management Processes documentation provides an overview of the types/categories of cases in scope. The list of all 149 types can/will be provided to the selected vendor upon contract award.
53	Regarding the fit/gap analysis table, item 28 on page 55, is an integration with the billing system required or simply tracking of payments in the case management system? Is the case management system required to do any calculation of payments?	1.required 2.yes
54	Regarding the fit/gap analysis table, item 30 on page 55, where is the hold likely to be initiated from - the case management system or an internal RRC system?	This will be defined as part of the analysis activities
55	Will RRC please extend the due date for one week based on the complexity of the RFP?	No
56	<u>Integrations</u> The RFP currently indicates a requirements to integrate with “existing data repositories” or “existing RRC inspection applications”. Can you provide a list of comprehensive required integrations that are part of this bid?	This will be defined as part of the analysis activities. RRC intends to be a very active participant in the integration activities. Regardless of the number of systems integrations, the Respondents should provide the integration mechanisms and protocols for their proposed solution. RRC will evaluate those as part of the responses.
57	<u>Reporting</u> Can you provide a list of specific reports that are “required” as part of the project? If not, should we assume that only the reporting examples that are included in the RFP are required to be built out by the vendor as part of this project?	This will be defined as part of the analysis activities
58	<u>Data Migration</u> Can you confirm that NO data migration is in scope for this project?	See answer to question 41
59	<u>Mobility</u> “The product must conform with responsive design principles for use on desktop, laptop, and mobile platforms.” Does TX RRC have a standardized mobile platform in use across the organization?	No
60	<u>Calendaring</u> Does RRC currently use Microsoft Outlook to track <u>ALL</u> hearings? If not, what scheduling tool does RRC use to determine hearing availability and maintain attendee list?	Microsoft Outlook
61	<u>Training</u> Would RRC be open to a “train the trainer” approaching to training?	If that is what the respondent considers most appropriate, yes
62	1.1 page 6: A) Did the State work with a vendor or vendors to prepare RFO #455-18-9003? B) If so, is that vendor (or are those vendors) eligible to bid on RFO #455-18-9003? C) Will the State please identify the vendor(s)?	a. Yes b. No c. Gartner
63	1.1.2, page 6:	a. No

	<p>The RFO notes that the Scope of work specified in this solicitation is expected to be part on an ongoing effort.</p> <p>A) Has the State been working with a vendor or vendors on these efforts?</p> <p>B) If so, will the State please identify the vendor or vendors?</p> <p>C) Is that vendor (or are those vendors) eligible to bid on RFO #455-18-9003?</p>	<p>b. N/A</p> <p>c. N/A</p>
64	<p>1.1.2 page 6: The RFO states: “The RRC received approval for the Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019, to continue efforts to transform its business operations into a more modern, flexible, and agile web-based environment...”</p> <p>Will the State please disclose the expected budget for RFO #455-18-9003?</p>	No
65	<p>2.2, page 8.: Will the State please confirm our understanding that all requirements listed in RFO #455-18-9003 are deliverables within the present Scope of Work?</p> <p>(In other words, this statement, “As funding is available in succeeding biennia, RRC plans to build on the progress made with this contract • Incorporate other types of agency inspections into the new inspection framework, and • Implement the remaining case types into the new case management solution” refers to some future, not-yet-specified Scope?)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>RRC understands that not all 149 case types may be implemented in the first biennium (FY18/19), therefore, this solicitation’s scope allows for a phased approach in which the vendors can/should propose a certain amount of case types to be implemented in the first biennium and the rest in the subsequent biennium.</p>
66	<p>2.4.5 page 10.: The RFO states “The RRC requires all critical project activities to be conducted on site at RRC’s headquarters offices ...”</p> <p>In order to minimize costs to the State and maximize the efficiency and security of configured system features, will the State consider defining activities to be conducted at RRC headquarters as certain high-level information gathering and strategic consulting.</p>	<p>Yes, however the respondent should disclose/propose the activities they consider will not be onsite. RRC will review and approve or discuss with the respondent until an agreement is reached.</p>
67	<p>Requirement 83, page 61; Requirement 137, page 67; etc.: The RFO states a need for offline usability in a few sections. In order to optimize the State’s initial investment in this system, is the State willing to limiting offline functionality to those interfaces for which it is needed (for example, field inspectors)?</p>	Offline usability is only needed for the inspection system.
68	<p>Reporting features, page 265; etc: The RFO states: “The product can allow a user to export documents to PDF, MS Word, or MS Excel”</p> <p>Some types of content are better supported by Excel format than others. In order to minimize budget, is the State willing to limit export in Excel format to those documents suited for it?</p>	This will be defined as part of the analysis activities
69	RFO Reference: Page 23, Section 3.6.1. Number and Form of Submission Copies:	If Respondent’s Offer contains any information, which Respondent claims is confidential and not subject to release under the PIA, Respondent must prepare and

	<p><i>RFO Reference: Page 24, Section 3.6.2. Confidential Information; Public Information Act Disclosures:</i> If Respondent's Offer contains any information that the Respondent claims is confidential and not subject to release under the PIA (e.g., bank account information, social security numbers, etc.), how many CDs or USB flash drives are required? Three full copies and two redacted copies? Or two full copies and two redacted copies?</p>	<p>deliver to RRC "FOUR" CDs or USB flash drives containing the following information:</p> <p>1. Two (2) CDs or USB flash drives containing complete copies of all of Respondent's submissions pursuant to this RFO. Respondent must mark these "Complete Offer Documents, [Respondent's Name], Railroad Commission of Texas RFO 455-18-9003 CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION."</p> <p>Two (2) CDs or USB flash drives, each containing copies of all of Respondent's submissions with all information claimed as confidential excised, blacked out, or otherwise redacted. Each of these CDs or USB flash drives must also contain an Appendix which contains clear references to all redacted information including a general description of the redacted information. Respondent must mark these CDs or USB flash drives "For Public Release: Redacted Version of [Respondent's Name], Railroad Commission of Texas RFO 455-18-9003".</p>
70	<p><i>RFO Reference: Page 25, Section 3.9 Offer Elements:</i> In which response section should the mandatory attachments be included? For example, Attachment 4 is referenced under multiple sections (3.9, 3.9.5, 3.10.2). Is it acceptable to include the mandatory attachments as individual appendices and referenced from the other response sections?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
71	<p><i>RFO Reference: Page 28, Section 3.10.2. General Respondent Information and Disclosures, #7 & #8:</i> Items #7 and #8 in section 3.10.2 of the RFO reference a "#7" and a "#8" in "Attachment 4." However, Attachment 4 does not contain sections numbered "#7" or "#8." Please clarify if answers to #7 and #8 in Section 3.10.2. should be included in Attachment 4 and if so, where specifically.</p>	<p>3.10.2. Respondent must submit the following information as part of their offer, as part of Attachment 4 – Respondent's Qualification Statement, in accordance with the <i>General Offer Information and Mandatory Requirements Submission Checklist</i> in Section 3.10.7, Table 3.</p> <p>Separate the following listed items in the same numerical order as numerated below.</p> <p>Response to listed items 7 & 8, Respondents may provide this information as part of their offer as a separate document included with Attachment 4.</p>
72	<p><i>RFO Reference: General:</i> Can the number of SMEs and their respective area of expertise be provided so we can scope the duration and effort for analysis/design?</p>	<p>Total number of SMEs will be under 30 for all areas.</p>
73	<p><i>RFO Reference: Pricing:</i> Deliverable 1: Work Plan – how/where should this be priced on Attachment 3?</p> <p>Deliverable 4: Transition Plan and Maintenance Support – how/where should this be priced on Attachment 3?</p> <p>2.5.6.6. Training and Knowledge Transfer – how/where should training be priced on Attachment 3?</p>	<p>1. add a new line 2. add a new line (or as many as the respondent needs for these activities/deliverables) 3. add a new line (or as many as the respondent needs for these activities/deliverables)</p>

74	RFO Reference: Page 16, Section 2.5.6.6. Training and Knowledge Transfer: What in an estimated number and type of users planned to be involved in the Training process? External users/constituents to be involved?	Direct training is intended for RRC users only. External user's training can be achieved through video tutorials, user guides, FAQs, and/or any other techniques proposed by the respondent.
75	RFO Reference: Page 15, 2.5.6.5. Testing: What is an estimated number and type of users planned to be involved in the UAT process? External users/constituents to be involved?	Yes, to some external users being involved in the testing. RRC and selected vendor will decide in the number of external users.
76	RFO Reference: Page 8, Section 2.3. Implementation Strategy; Attachment 15, page 176, Potential Integration Points: Regarding RRC Systems / Integrations: - Can an explicit list of these systems be provided? Will this system interact with electronic court filing system?	1. This will be defined during the analysis activities. 2. RRC cannot answer as we need clarification of the electronic court filing system question
77	RFO Reference: Page 58, Attachment 2 Case Management – External Secured Portal Features, line item #61: <i>The secure portal will provide the ability to submit payment of fees, penalties, and reimbursements for a case (integration with RRC systems).</i> Will payment submission go through Texas.gov, ARTS, etc. or some other payment mechanism already in place by RRC?	See answer to question 8. RRC uses Texas.gov
78	RFO Reference: Page 66, Attachment 2, Inspection System – Reporting Features, line item #126: <i>The product can populate a management dashboard.</i> What tool will be used for this? Will it be Oracle BI, since it is mentioned as an existing software?	RRC does not have a preference on a tool
79	RFO Reference: Page 26, Section 3.9.2. Technical Approach: <i>The RRC follows the State of Texas (DIR Project Delivery Framework including Framework Extensions), therefore the Offers for this RFO must be inclusive of the creation of these required artifacts.</i> Which Project Delivery Framework deliverables have been completed? Is it safe to assume that all deliverables described in the Texas Project Delivery Framework Reference Guide will need to be completed by Vendor? (https://pubext.dir.texas.gov/portal/internal/resources/DocumentLibrary/Framework%20Reference%20Guide.pdf) Transformation of this magnitude typically requires significant change management. Does the RRC expect the vendor to be responsible for change management activities?	1. Only initiation documents have been completed. 2. RRC follows an internal change management process. Both the selected vendor and RRC will be responsible for change management activities.
80	RFO Reference: Page 174, Section Data Concepts - Generated Documents: Please provide a full list of documents and reports that are in scope for this project phase?	This will be defined during the analysis activities

81	RFO Reference: Page 175, Section Data Concepts - Queries and Searches: Please provide a full list of queries and searches that are in scope for this project phase?	This will be defined during the analysis activities
82	RFO Reference: Page 8, Section 2.1, Project Goals and Objectives: 1. Increase consistency across agency data (including nomenclature standardization); What level, if any, of nomenclature standardization has been completed? If none, is the facilitation of nomenclature standardization and the facilitation of obtaining consensus on standard nomenclature part of the scope of this RFO for the Vendor?	RRC has achieved the level of standardization provided in the Business Process Maps and data dictionaries. Any additional work needed on this matter to implement the solution is in scope of this project
83	RFO Reference: Page 11, Section 2.5.3 Case Management System: How many total RRC personnel will need to access the Case Management System?	See answers to questions 32, 33 and 34
84	RFO Reference: Page 203, Attachment 17 Case Management High Level Features, External Secured Portal Features: How many unique users will need access to the secured portal?	See answers to questions 32, 33 and 34
85	RFO Reference: Page 203, Attachment 17 Case Management High Level Features, Public Portal Features: What is the anticipated number of hits on the public portal on a daily / monthly basis?	As this is not currently available in our public website, RRC cannot determine a number at this time.
86	RFO Reference: Page 11, Section 2.5.3 Case Management System: Approximately how many documents/images/videos/etc. are associated to a case and/or a docket? What is the breakdown by each type of file?	As this can vary broadly, it is unknown at this time
87	RFO Reference: Page 12, Section 2.5.4 Inspection Management System: Approximately how many documents/images/videos/etc. are associated to an inspection? What is the breakdown by each type of file?	As this can vary broadly, it is unknown at this time
88	RFO Reference: Page 62, Attachment 2, Inspection System – Prepare for Inspection Features, line item # 93 (The product can integrate with ESRI ArcGIS products for navigation) and page 67, Inspection System – Integration Features, line item #141 (The product can integrate with ESRI ArcGIS products): Describe the use case for ArcGIS integration with the system.	This will be defined during the analysis activities
89	RFO Reference: Page 117, Attachment 14 Architecture Description and Diagram, Integration Strategy, Requirements and Standards, including Security: For Mainframe, it is mentioned that “integrations could be with formatted text files running on regular basis.” Is RRC capable of CICS integration?	The vendor should provide a solution which integrates with system information provided
90	RFO Reference: Page 62, Attachment 2 Technical Approach, Security Questionnaire, Authentication:	No. RRC manages and controls its own authentication services

	Does RRC have an existing security provider / directory for authentication of internal RRC employees?	
91	RFO Reference: Page 62, Attachment 2 Technical Approach, Security Questionnaire, Authentication: Does RRC have an existing security provider / directory for external entities?	No. RRC uses an application level security module for external users
92	RFO Reference: Page 6, PART I. GENERAL INFORMATION, 1.1.2. Background: <i>One of the focal points of the IETRS program is to help RRC move from paper-based forms into web-based solutions.</i> Can we get copies of sample forms RRC is looking to replace with the new system?	This will be defined during the analysis activities
93	RFO Reference: Page 6, PART I. GENERAL INFORMATION, 1.1.2. Background: <i>One of the focal points of the IETRS program is to help RRC move from paper-based forms into web-based solutions.</i> What is the number of forms that will need to be replaced?	This will be defined during the analysis activities
94	RFO Reference: Page 260, Attachment 20 Inspection System High Level Features, Document Inspection Results Features: Does the system need to generate printable PDFs of a specific layout / structure?	This will be defined during the analysis activities
95	RFO Reference: Page 52, Attachment 2 Technical Approach, Case Management – General Features: RRC mentions integration with existing systems. What integration methods are available for integrating with the existing RRC systems (web services, direct APIs, file based, etc.)?	RRC typically uses web services for integrations. See answer to question 2.
96	RFO Reference: Page 52, Attachment 2 Technical Approach, Case Management: Does the application need to follow the agency's document retention / records management policies? (Ability to provide legal holds, etc.)?	Yes
97	RFO Reference: Page 8, Section 2.2. Scope, Bullet 2: What are the other inspection types and do they differ in the type/nature of the data being collected/tracked? If so, how significantly?	RRC also inspects oil and gas leases and wells, gas plants, certain types of mines, and other facilities. These entities do differ in the data being tracked but the process has been mapped in the documentation attached to this solicitation. The selected vendor will determine the significance of difference during the requirements analysis phase of the project
98	RFO Reference: Page 10-11, Section 2.5.2. Work Plan: Are the documents listed in Section 2.5.2 Work Plan due with the Work Plan Deliverable (within 21 days) or are they milestones to be noted within the Work Plan.	All due with the work plan within 21 days. Please note that for item 2c, RRC expects the selected vendor to describe the techniques to be used for development of the documents listed, not the actual document.
99	RFO Reference: Page 174, Attachment 15 Case Management Business Process Mapping: How many documents are expected to be templated and generated in an automated fashion by the solution/system?	1. There is a list of documents that could be generated by the new system, beginning on page 174 of the RFO. The list will be expanded and refined during the requirements analysis phase of the project 2.No

	<p>Can RRC provide document examples in scope for this project and a list of fields/data that are expected to be merged into the document?</p> <p>How many users for each user role will need to access the system?</p> <p>Do the defined roles within the process flow details represent users having the exact same set of system access rights? Is this a good representation of the number of system roles that will be implemented?</p> <p>Does the “Actors” column in the process flow details represent all relevant parties to that process, or just those that move the process step along?</p> <p>Will this solution be the system of record for any documents stored within it? If so, which documents, and how are they produced?</p> <p>Do the potential integration points listed have complete data dictionaries and ERD diagrams that can be provided?</p>	<p>3. See answers to questions 32, 33 and 34</p> <p>4. No</p> <p>5. The selected vendor will define the number of system roles during the requirements analysis phase of the project</p> <p>6. The actors represented are intended to represent relevant parties, but might not be all-inclusive</p> <p>7. Yes. Documents will be identified during the requirements analysis phase of the project</p> <p>8. Some documentation exists for each of the systems with potential integration points. This documentation will be provided to the selected vendor.</p>
100	<p>RFO Reference: Page 52, Attachment 2 Technical Approach Fit Gap:</p> <p>Is there a necessity for telephone integration? Are these cases taken/transcribed from phone/email/fax?</p>	No
101	<p>RFO Reference: Page 52, Attachment 2 Technical Approach Fit Gap, General Features: Requirements 2, 4, 5 - Populate organization data based on ID:</p> <p>Is this a real time integration with an RRC system, or can a copy of this data exist within the solution?</p> <p>How often does this data change?</p> <p>What are some approximate data sizes (for example, number of regulated entities)?</p>	<p>1. This will be determined during the requirements analysis phase of the project</p> <p>2. This data can change at any time</p> <p>3. This will be determined during the requirements analysis phase of the project</p>
102	<p>RFO Reference: Page 52, Attachment 2 Technical Approach Fit Gap, General Features: Requirement 6:</p> <p>Does this imply that there are dynamic elements to the type of data that is captured during intake (i.e. changing questions based on type)?</p>	Yes
103	<p>RFO Reference: Page 52, Attachment 2 Technical Approach Fit Gap, Case Management External Secured Portal Features: Requirement 62:</p> <p>What are the legal requirements for “electronic signatures” for this system? For example, a typed name, hand written signature, or registered name and registration number through a specific provider, etc.</p>	The determination of electronic signature requirement is dependent upon use which varies by program area requirement. This should be addressed during design once requirements are understood
104	<p>RFO Reference: Page 131, Create Case (1.1) – 1.1.3:</p> <p>Is it correct to assume that the source of these artifacts will be existing Oracle/mainframe based?</p>	Yes
105	<p>RFO Reference: Page 133, Section Pursue Compliance (1.2) – 1.2.4.2, 1.2.4.4:</p> <p>Is it correct to assume that these communications are also expected to be generated automatically?</p>	At a high level, yes. This will be determined during the requirements analysis phase of the project

106	<p>RFO Reference: Page 155, Commission Action (1.9) – 1.9.2:</p> <p>Is the intent for all or some these materials and notebooks to be generated, stored, or disseminated from the new system, or just agendas?</p> <p>Can you provide two examples of differing case subject text/styles?</p> <p>Is the integration with existing systems envisioned to be unidirectional (i.e. only callouts for pre-population data) or bi-directional? (i.e. in the event of a Hold or update to company information, would an action in this system be expected to result in an update in a legacy system?)</p> <p>Is there any additional information around the specific intended functions of the Outlook integration?</p>	<p>1. The intent is for electronic notebooks to be generated, stored, and disseminated via the new system</p> <p>2. Note: Items in brackets (<>) are placeholders for information unique to the case. Example for an Enforcement Case: TO CONSIDER WHETHER TO ENTER A COMMISSION ORDER ASSESSING ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTIES AND/OR REQUIRING COMPLIANCE WITH COMMISSION REGULATIONS ON THE <OPERATOR NAME & P5 NUMBER> OPERATOR, <LEASE NAME & NUMBER> LEASE, WELL NO. <WELL NUMBER>, <FIELD NAME & NUMBER> FIELD, [or <FACILITY NAME> FACILITY, PERMIT NO. <PERMIT NUMBER>.] <COUNTY NAME> COUNTY, TEXAS VIOLATION OF SWR <RULE VIOLATED></p> <p>3. Integration will be bi-directional</p> <p>4. The Outlook integration will assist with hearing scheduling, as stated on page 206 of the RFO.</p>
107	<p>RFO Reference: Page 216, Prepare for Inspection (0.1) – 0.1.4:</p> <p>Is the checklist a standard form based on entity/cause?</p> <p>What type of ArcGIS subscription does RRC currently hold?</p>	<p>Inspectors currently do not use ArcGIS to locate installations. They use Garmin XMap. Inspectors may transition to an ArcGIS or another GIS product in the future</p>
108	<p>RFO Reference: Page 16, Section 2.5.6.6 - Training and Knowledge Transfer:</p> <p>Can the RRC provide additional detail for what is expected for Online Help portion of the Training Deliverable?</p>	<p>The Online Help should contain comprehensive instructions for end users regarding all features and functionality delivered in the solution. The RRC expects the help file to be accessible from the solution</p>
109	<p>RFO Reference: Page 13, Inspection Process, Integration Points:</p> <p>Can the RRC provided additional detail for what is expected regarding Weather integration?</p>	<p>This potential integration could be a link to a publicly available weather app, website, or other service. RRC is open to suggestions from the Vendor on satisfying this need.</p>
110	<p>RFO Reference: Page 15 NOTE: RRC does not expect data migration activities to be a part of the work to be accomplished in this biennium.:</p> <p>With data migrations out of scope, does RRC assume a point forward solution?</p>	<p>For this biennium, RRC expects a point forward solution</p>
111	<p>RFO Reference: Page 17, Attachment 14:</p> <p>Please provide hardware and software used in the current imaging and content management solution.</p>	<p>This is currently outsourced to a vendor</p>

All other aspects of the **RFO# 455-18-9003** remain as is.

Jesse Herrera, CPPO, CTCM, CTCD
Contract Management
Phone: 512-463-6736
Email: jesse.herrera@rrc.texas.gov

RECEIPT OF ADDENDUM #4 OF RFO #445-18-9003

IN YOUR SUBMITTAL THE RESPONDENT SHALL ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS ADDENDUM.

Respondent Signature

Date

Printed Name

Company Name