

RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS

OPERATIONS DIVISION

ADDENDUM #2

DATE: 05/01/2026

RFQ: 455-26-1018

TITLE: SALESFORCE AND TOOLS IMPLEMENTATION SERVICES AND SUPPORT

PROPOSAL DEADLINE: Tuesday, May 19, 2026, at 2:00 PM Central Standard Time

Item 1:

The purpose of this Addendum is to publicize submitted questions with answers:

NO.	QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
1	Has the agency conducted any formal assessment or prioritization of the legacy applications listed in Section A.17 to determine their readiness, complexity, or criticality for migration or enhancement within the Salesforce platform? If so, will that documentation be made available to Offerors prior to the Response due date?	Yes, this can be provided after contract award.
2.	We wanted to reach out to you and let you know that Silotech Group based in San Antonio is very interested in supporting the STISS effort (455-26-1018) due next month. We had also wanted to know if there were any other documents such as a Statement of Work or a Performance Work Statement that had been released in addition to what has been to this point.	No additional documents have been released other than Addendum 1, which revised the date that RRC would respond to vendor questions.
3.	Regarding this opportunity, could you please provide information on the following: A. Supporting Documentation: Where can I find the supporting documents and additional detailed requirements? Is there a specific website where these are hosted? B. Submission Requirements: Is there a list of mandatory special documents or compulsory requirements that must be included with the proposal? C. Budget: What are the budget criteria or the "not to exceed" range for this project?	A. The supporting documentation mentioned in the solicitation is in Section 4 of the VetHub Subcontracting Plan Document. The supporting documentation is to be provided by the offeror to confirm to RRC that the offeror has provided true and correct information in the Subcontracting Plan Document and to confirm that a Good Faith Effort was made by the offeror. There is no mention of "additional detailed requirements" in the solicitation. All items associated with the solicitation are included in the items posted to the ESBD. Any additional items, if any are added, will be included in an amendment which will be posted to the ESBD.

	D. Staffing: How many resources is the agency looking for? Additionally, is this for permanent placement or contract hourly-based services? E. Service Location: Are there specific criteria regarding onshore or offshore service delivery?	B. Please see Part B and C of the solicitation for items that must be included with the response. C. RRC will not be disclosing this information. D. Resources may vary by workorder. This opportunity is a Deliverables Based IT Services opportunity. The offeror is to determine the number and type of resources they believe will be needed to complete the deliverable. E. Please see item 12 at Section A.24 RRC Workorder Expectations of Vendor.
4.	I came across this RFO recently and wanted to reach out with a quick question. I noticed Conga is listed as one of the additional tools included. Do you consider alternatives to some of these specific solutions? We are a competitor of S-Docs, and we are particularly well suited for Governemnt clients because of our Salesforce native architecture and security. We work with many Federal and State customers, including the Texas Office of Attorney General.	RRC is open to considering alternatives.
5.	Can RRC confirm whether this procurement will be executed under a DIR Cooperative contract (e.g., DBITS) or as a standalone contract?	This opportunity will be bid as a standalone contract.
6.	Does the proposer need to be a DBITS contract holder, or is this open to any vendor?	This opportunity is open to all vendors who are authorized to do business in the State of Texas.
7.	Can RRC confirm whether Salesforce licenses are already procured, and if so, which clouds/products are currently in use (e.g., Service Cloud, Experience Cloud, Platform)?	RRC has Salesforce licenses in quantities to support adjacent/existing applications. • Lightning Platform Plus – Unlimited Edition • Customer Community and Customer Community Plus Logins • Salesforce Shield • Government Cloud Premiere + Success Plan
8.	What is the current scale of the Salesforce environment (number of users, org structure, environments)?	Approximately 480 internal users with platform license, 40 with Dev/SF license, and 16K+ external users.

9.	Are there existing limitations or constraints related to Salesforce licensing that vendors should consider in solution design?	Yes, details can be provided after contract award.
10.	Does RRC anticipate procuring additional Salesforce products (e.g., Experience Cloud expansion, Data Cloud, AI capabilities) under this contract?	Not under this contract.
11.	Can RRC provide a current-state architecture diagram of existing Salesforce implementations and integrated systems?	This can be provided after the contract award.
12.	What integration patterns are currently in use (API-led via MuleSoft, batch, point-to-point)?	API-led via MuleSoft and batch integrations.
13.	Are there known integration pain points or performance issues with current systems?	Some pain points exist with the MuleSoft and batch integrations.
14.	What is the expected volume and frequency of data exchange between systems?	Varies.
15.	What is the estimated volume and structure of data to be migrated for the initial TDRF workorder?	TDRF currently uses a structured relational database hosted on an Oracle database; therefore, the data migration effort is expected to present minimal challenges.

16.	What known data quality issues exist in current systems?	This can be provided after contract award.
17.	Are there established data governance policies or data dictionaries available?	RRC has a data governance program in place, in alignment with SB475 requirements. We also have a data classification SOP, and all new projects must comply with these requirements.
18.	Will RRC provide data cleansing support, or is this expected to be fully vendor-managed?	RRC will handle most data cleansing activities, but vendor participation will still be required for certain tasks.
19.	Does RRC have target timelines or expected duration ranges for the initial TDRF workorder?	All work must be completed before 8/31/2027.
20.	What is the anticipated cadence for issuing future Workorders (e.g., monthly, quarterly)?	As needed.
21.	Are there priority systems or initiatives that RRC expects to be addressed first beyond TDRF?	RRC is in the process of developing the roadmap for remaining systems that will go into Salesforce.
22.	How should vendors account for dependencies between concurrent Workorders?	RRC currently holds bi-weekly coordination meetings amongst existing vendors and RRC staff working on different applications within the SF platform. These "scrum of scrum" meetings have been effective, and RRC intends to continue this practice.
23.	How does RRC plan to coordinate work across multiple vendors operating under this contract?	Please see the answer to question 22.

24.	Will a prime vendor be designated for integration or program-level governance?	RRC is responsible for program-level governance.
25.	What are RRC's expectations regarding collaboration and responsibility boundaries between vendors?	Please see the answer to question 22.
26.	How will conflicts or overlapping responsibilities between vendors be resolved?	Please see the answer to question 22.
27.	Can RRC provide user personas or representative workflows for key stakeholder groups (e.g., inspectors, operators, public users)?	Yes, this can be provided after contract award.
28.	What are the most critical pain points experienced by internal users today?	Specifics can be provided after contract award.
29.	What are RRC's expectations for external user experience (e.g., portal usability, accessibility)?	This will be defined during the requirements gathering phase of each workorder.
30.	Are there existing UX standards or design guidelines vendors must follow?	Yes.
31.	Can RRC provide additional detail on TXCC security control expectations specific to this project?	Additional detail will be provided after contract award.

32.	Are there predefined security architectures or patterns that vendors must adhere to?	This can be provided after contract award.
33.	Will all solutions be required to be hosted within State-approved environments (e.g., DIR Shared Technology Services)?	Yes.
34.	Are there specific data residency or segregation requirements beyond standard TXCC guidance?	This can be provided after contract award.
35.	What environments will RRC provide (e.g., dev, test, UAT, production)?	Dev, Test, UAT, Production
36.	Will vendors be responsible for environment setup and management?	No, RRC will be responsible.
37.	Are there existing automated testing frameworks or tools in place?	Yes.
38.	What level of RRC participation is expected during UAT?	RRC business users are expected to participate in UAT.
39.	What are the key reporting and analytics use cases RRC expects to support?	This will be documented during the requirements gathering phase.

40.	Are there existing reporting tools or dashboards that must be maintained or replaced?	Yes.
41.	What are the expected data latency requirements for reporting (real-time vs batch)?	This can be provided after contract award.
42.	Are there predefined KPIs or performance metrics RRC intends to track?	Standard KPIs; anything additional can be determined after contract award.
43.	Pricing is deliverable-based, but scope variability creates ambiguity.	Pricing is to be deliverable based upon the information provided in the detailed workorder in the solicitation. Additional items may be added by RRC issuance of a workorder. The hourly rate items in Attachment 5, Table 2 are for skillsets that can be deployed on an hourly rate basis for service and support.
44.	How should vendors account for variability in scope across future Workorders?	Please see the answer to question 43 and Section A.38. Service Change Management in the solicitation document.
45.	Will RRC provide guidance on expected budget ranges for typical Workorders?	Please see the answer to question 3, item C.
46.	How will pricing adjustments be handled for changes in scope or unforeseen complexity?	Please see the answer to question 44.
47.	Are there expectations for cost optimization or cost-sharing mechanisms across multi-year engagements?	Unknown currently due to workorder variations.

48.	Is RRC open to incorporating intelligent automation or AI-assisted capabilities within the Salesforce platform to enhance workflow efficiency?	If authorized by the RRC, generative AI may be used for development of solutions.
49.	Are there any restrictions or policies regarding the use of AI-enabled features in state systems?	Please see the answer to question 48.
50.	Would RRC consider phased adoption of such capabilities as part of future Workorders?	A phased approach would be acceptable.
51.	What is the expected scale and format of training (e.g., number of users, in-person vs virtual)?	This can be determined after contract is awarded and may also vary by work order.
52.	Does RRC have existing training materials or programs that vendors should build upon?	This can be determined after contract is awarded and may also vary by work order.
53.	What are RRC's expectations for knowledge transfer to internal staff?	RRC expects that any work performed by any vendor should account for knowledge transfer to RRC staff.
54.	Beyond the stated scoring criteria, are there specific factors RRC considers critical in evaluating Workplan quality?	No.
55.	Will vendor presentations or demonstrations be required as part of the evaluation process?	It is possible that presentations/demonstrations could be required if it is deemed to be necessary for RRC to determine the best path forward.

56.	How will RRC evaluate the realism and feasibility of proposed Workplans?	RRC will evaluate workplans based upon the criteria listed in the solicitation.
57.	For the TDRF Workorder 1, will RRC provide access to the existing TDRF system, data schemas, and current business process documentation during the proposal phase, or only post-award?	Post Award.
58.	The RFO references integration with CASES, PIPES, and a payment portal — can RRC confirm whether the payment portal is an existing RRC system, a third-party processor (e.g., Xpress Bill Pay, Forte), or a new procurement, and whether the vendor is responsible for procurement of any net-new components?	Third-party - Texas.gov, SnapPay
59.	Regarding the automated matching logic for linking excavator and operator reports (A.16.1) — does RRC have existing matching rules/criteria documented, or will defining those rules be part of the requirements-gathering phase?	This will be documented during the requirements gathering phase.
60.	Can RRC confirm whether the GoAnywhere, RunMyJobs, and Neubus platforms are managed by RRC ITS or by third-party managed service providers, and whether vendor will have direct API/integration access to these systems?	Combination of RRC and third-party managed. Vendor will have access.
61.	For the TDRF data migration, can RRC provide an estimate of the volume of historical records (incidents, reports, dockets, payments) and the current data format/source system so the workplan pricing reflects accurate effort?	Please see the answer to question 15.
62.	Will RRC's Chief Data Officer be providing data classification guidance and Informatica CDGC configurations during requirements gathering, or is the vendor expected to propose the data classification schema?	Yes, RRC's CDO will provide data classification guidance.
63.	Section B.8 scores the draft Workplan at 25 points, will RRC evaluate Workplans on a defined rubric, and if so, can RRC share the scoring criteria or any weighting between schedule, methodology, and staffing?	Please see the answer to question 56.

64.	Will RRC be requesting oral presentations or demos as part of the evaluation process per Section B.8, and if so, approximately when in the evaluation timeline?	Please see the answer to question 59.
65.	Section A.24.10 requires critical project activities to be performed on-site at RRC headquarters in Austin. Can RRC define which activities it currently anticipates designating as "critical" for the TDRF workorder, or will that be determined post-award?	RRC expects activities such as kick-off meetings or presentations/demos to executive leadership to have key personnel on site. There may be a small number of instances where "requirements gathering, UAT support, deployment" may be more effective if conducted onsite, and RRC expects those to also be accommodated by the vendor. The remaining activities can be conducted remotely within the continental US. No work may be performed by vendor staff or subcontractors when located outside of the continental US.
66.	Will RRC provide Salesforce sandbox environments for development and testing, or is the vendor responsible for provisioning sandbox orgs? If vendor-provisioned, will RRC accept Developer/Partial sandboxes or require Full sandboxes?	RRC will provide Salesforce sandbox environments.
67.	For the MINERS full build-out referenced in A.17.6, does RRC anticipate issuing that workorder within the original contract term (through August 2028), and has a preliminary budget range been established?	This is unknown at this time, and the decision will be made based upon agency needs.
68.	Is RRC open to a single vendor being awarded work on multiple future workorders simultaneously, or does RRC intend to sequence workorders to limit concurrent vendor activity?	Multiple Workorders may run concurrently.
69.	The RFO states that "critical project activities" must be performed on-site at RRC headquarters in Austin, while non-critical work can be done remotely within the U.S. Can the RRC provide examples of which specific project phases or roles are typically classified as "critical"?	Please see the answer to question 65.
70.	For U.S.-based remote workers, the RFO requires the use of RRC-approved remote access tools. Will the RRC provide VPN clients and/or state-issued hardware for remote personnel, or is Vendor expected to provision VDI environments/laptops equipped with specific security agents?	RRC will provide VPN.

71.	Section A.19 lists RRC resources such as Subject Matter Experts (SMEs), IT staff, and Business Analysts. What is the expected weekly time commitment/availability of RRC SMEs during critical phases like Requirements Gathering and UAT?	The time commitment varies by role and project phase. RRC will ensure resources are available as needed to ensure success of work orders.
72.	For the Texas Damage Reporting Form (TDRF) migration, the scope mentions migrating legacy data. Can RRC provide an estimated volume (e.g., record count, file sizes) and identify the current source system database format for this legacy data?	Please see the answer to question 15.
73.	The TDRF project requires external users to submit violation payments. What existing payment gateway or processor does the RRC/State of Texas currently use, and are there existing Salesforce integrations for this gateway that Vendor should leverage?	Texas.gov, SnapPay. Yes, integrations exist.
74.	The TDRF system requires automated letter generation (e.g., No Report, Homeowner, Final Notice). Given that Conga is listed in the technology stack, will the RRC provide existing Conga templates to port over, or should we plan to design these templates entirely from scratch?	Existing templates can be made available upon contract award.
75.	Regarding the TDRF external user portal via the Railroad Commission Access Management Process (RAMP), approximately how many concurrent external users (both authenticated and unauthenticated) does the RRC anticipate the system will need to support?	Not known at this time.
76.	TDRF requires integrations with both the PIPES and CASES applications. Are the necessary APIs/endpoints already established in PIPES and CASES, or will Vendor be responsible for building the connection points on both ends of the integration?	No API needed as both applications are in Salesforce.
77.	The RFO lists multiple enterprise integration and data tools, including MuleSoft, Informatica, GoAnywhere, and Snowflake. Does the RRC have a prescribed architecture standard dictating when to use which tool (e.g., MuleSoft for real-time APIs vs. Informatica for batch ETL)?	This can be determined after contract award.

78.	To meet Texas Cyber Command (TXCC) data classification and security standards, is the RRC currently utilizing Salesforce Shield or specific third-party AppExchange products, or will Vendor be expected to recommend a security architecture?	RRC is using Salesforce Shield.
79.	Does RRC utilize Salesforce Signature level service in any current implementation? If so, is Signature Service mandatory for solutions implemented under this RFO or subsequent procurements?	RRC utilizes Premier-level support.
80.	For deployment and ALM, Copado and JIRA are listed. Will Vendor have administrative access to configure RRC's existing Copado pipelines, or will deployments be executed by an internal RRC release management team?	RRC is responsible for configuring Copado pipelines. Vendor team lead will be responsible for deployments.
81.	The RFO notes a preference for delivering "independent and deployable increments of functionality." Does the RRC currently utilize a specific Agile framework (e.g., Scrum, SAFe) that the Vendor project management team should adopt to ensure smooth collaboration?	RRC uses a hybrid approach.
82.	The RFO outlines a robust backlog of future Workorders. Does the RRC anticipate executing these future Workorders sequentially, or is there an expectation that multiple Workorders may run concurrently, requiring parallel delivery teams?	Please see the answer to question 68.
83.	Regarding the RRC MAP enhancements, will the required integrations with the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) GIS Map require the vendor to interface directly with PUC technical teams, or will RRC stakeholders act as the sole intermediary?	RRC does not expect vendor to interface directly with PUC technical teams.
84.	For the future Alternative Fuels Online Filing System (AFOS) expansion, is the existing Minimum Viable Product (MVP) currently built on Salesforce, or is it a legacy system that requires a full platform migration?	Application is currently on Salesforce.
85.	The RFO mandates compliance with TAC 206 (Website Accessibility) and TAC 213 (Electronic Information Resources Accessibility). Will the RRC conduct independent third-party accessibility testing, or is Vendor required to provide the formal VPAT certification for external portals?	Vendor is expected to ensure accessibility testing is executed as part of every testing effort.

86.	Concerning the TX-RAMP cloud computing compliance, does this certification requirement apply to internal vendor development/testing tools if proposed, or strictly to the final hosted solutions provisioned for the RRC?	Any developed or proposed cloud solutions will require a review to see if TX-RAMP certification is required of the vendor. The scoping tool can be found on DIR's website .
87.	For the Workorder 1 binding deliverables pricing, if business requirements change significantly during the Requirements Gathering phase, will the RRC utilize the Change Management Process to adjust the binding deliverable costs?	Yes
88.	Does the RRC have a target legislative or operational deadline for the final deployment of the Workorder 1 (TDRF) system that should drive Vendors proposed Workplan schedule?	Please see the answer to question 19.
89.	Under the Deliverable Acceptance process, the RRC has up to 10 business days to inspect a deliverable, and another 10 days for stakeholder approval. For agile sprints, can this acceptance timeline be condensed for minor deliverables to prevent development bottlenecks?	Yes.
90.	Regarding the mandatory VetHUB Subcontracting Plan (HSP), if Vendor utilizes Method A (Meeting the HUB Goal), can the RRC clarify if the "agency-specific HUB goal" for this IT contract differs from the standard Texas statewide HUB goal for IT services?	There is not a "standard," and the RRC uses a good-faith effort model and does not have an "agency-specific HUB goal". Please complete the HSP and document your good faith efforts to solicit certified VetHub vendors.
91.	he RFO requires a Post-Deployment Support Logistics Plan. Does the RRC expect the vendor to provide Tier 1 (Helpdesk) support for external users post-deployment, or will the vendor solely provide Tier 2/Tier 3 technical support while RRC staff manages Tier 1?	Please see the answer to question 53.
92.	How many work orders do you expect to be active in parallel during the base term?	To be determined after contract award.

93.	For TDRF, what is already available in the existing IETRS Salesforce framework?	No TDRF framework is currently available. Some modules do exist within the Salesforce environment that could be modified for reuse. Those can be shared after contract award.
94.	What are the expected volumes for TDRF?	Please see the answer to question 15.
95.	What is the actual integration pattern for each named TDRF dependency?	This can be provided after contract award.
96.	What is the source and condition of the TDRF data to be migrated?	Please see the answer to question 15.
97.	How should external access work in practice?	External users must use RRC-approved authentication systems (RAMP, ForgeRock) to access RRC systems for identity and access management.
98.	What are the payment requirements?	Please see Attachment 6, Section 3.03 Payments to Vendor for payment terms. Payment will only be made for fully completed and accepted deliverables.
99.	How sophisticated must document generation be?	Documentation needs to be thorough, concise, and unambiguous.
100.	What level of security and compliance evidence will RRC require per work order?	Security requirements will be documented as apart of every work order.

101.	What are the concrete UAT and acceptance expectations?	Please see the solicitation at section A.30. Deliverable Acceptance.
102.	What RRC staffing commitment is actually available by role?	Please see the answer to question 71.
103.	How much of the work must be onsite?	RRC expects activities such as kick off meetings or presentations/demos to executive leadership to have key personnel on site. There may be a small number of instances where "requirements gathering, UAT support, deployment" may be more effective if conducted onsite, and RRC expects those to also be accommodated by the vendor. the remaining activities can be conducted remote within the continental US. No work may be performed by vendor staff or subcontractors when located outside of the US.
104.	Does RRC want a single deployment or incremental releases for TDRF?	Phased approach would be acceptable, but all must be completed before 8/31/2027.
105.	What tools are vendor-supplied versus RRC-supplied?	RRC will provide access to SF, JIRA, Copado, Bitbucket, Box, and Conga as needed.
106.	For future work orders, which systems are real near-term priorities versus informational only?	RRC is in the process of developing the roadmap for remaining systems that will go into Salesforce.
107.	What warranty/hypercare expectations apply after go-live?	RRC typically expects vendors to provide three to four-week hypercare to address major production issues.
108.	Can you provide more details on the budget constraints or funding availability	Please see the answer to question 6.

109.	Do commercial or government references carry different significance	Please see the solicitation at Section B5.3 Company Experience & Qualifications.
110.	Is there an ideal timeline?	Please see the answer to question 19.
111.	Are Key Personnel allowed to work remotely?	Yes.
112.	Is there any software that the state preferences?	Yes, however, RRC does have a process for reviewing and approving software that is not a part of RRC's approved software list.
113.	Upon Award-decision what kind of feedback can bidders expect to get on proposal submissions?	Vendors will be notified if they are selected to participate in subsequent bidding opportunities related to this solicitation, if any exist.
114.	What are the anticipated changes in project scope or priorities?	None are anticipated at this time.
115.	Can you detail any previous challenges encountered in similar projects?	Defining thorough and un-ambiguous requirements has been a challenge in previous projects.
116.	What were the challenges with the previous solutions?	Please see the answer to question 115.

117.	Is there an incumbent? How much was their contract worth?	Yes, their current contract along with all amendments, and the value associated with the contract can be found in the About Us section of RRC's website.
118.	Is the incumbent allowed to bid on the contract?	Yes.
119.	Have you worked with any vendor to do market research/put together this RFQ.	No.
120.	Are you interested in a vendor who has GSA Schedule pricing?	Please see the answer to question 6.
121.	Looking for in person training or virtual?	Please see the answer to question 51.
122.	We would like to kindly request a 1-week extension in order to incorporate new information from QnA?	RRC is unable to accommodate this request.
123.	What are the specific volumetric metrics (total record count, total data volume in GB/TB, and attachment sizes) for the legacy TPD_OWNER database targeted for migration?	Please see the answer to question 15.
124.	Given the recent emergency rules that eliminated statewide goals, what is the exact VetHUB utilization goal percentage applicable to this specific STISS contract?	Please see the answer to question 94.

125.	If the vendor extensively documents a Good Faith Effort but receives zero responsive bids from qualified VetHUBs due to the severely reduced pool of certified firms, will the submitted Subcontracting Plan still be evaluated as compliant?	Yes.
126.	For the TDRF App Data Migration, what is the approximate volume of records? Does the scope of data migration include all current and historical data, only current / active data, historical data related to current / active records (for example, historical data for open TDRF Incident, but not historical data for closed TDRF incidents), only current / active records, or some other cross-section of active / current with historical data?	Please see the answer to question 15.
127.	Regarding Data Migration activities, what is the division of responsibilities for the Vendor and for TX RRC? We are referring to for Data Cleansing, Data Mapping, Creation of Data Load Templates, Data Load / Execution, Data Verification, etc.	Combination of RRC and Vendor.
128.	How should Data Migration be incorporated into UAT (e.g., full data migration at start of UAT, partial representative data set at some point in UAT, etc.)?	Data migration requirements will be documentation as part of requirements phase, however we expect vendors migrate enough data to achieve thorough UAT.
129.	Are there any other details you can share about the Therefore system (e.g., how RRC is currently using Therefore, any existing or needed integrations) beyond "Manually record payments from Therefore. - get register number which will bring in payment info into SF."?	RRC Finance uses Therefore to enter payment details when physical check is received. Damage Prevention internal user only accesses Therefore to confirm payment is received and allocates payment. This process will not change.
130.	Are there any other details you can share about the Xerox integration (e.g., how RRC is currently using Xerox)?	Secure File Transfer Process, LCR, and currently Xerox is beginning to work on supporting Restful service.
131.	In the Gas Utility Regulatory Filings and Auditing System App - "Gas Utility Annual Reports Tracking...(data entry functionality deferred to later phase)", how will App data be maintained if the data entry piece is deferred? Is data entry performed by Internal and/or External Users? (see question below regarding External Portal)	Data entry will be done by internal staff in the first phase. The subsequent phases will allow for data entry by external entities.

132.	In the Gas Utility Regulatory Filings and Auditing System App - is an External Portal part of Phase 1?	No.
133.	Can RRC confirm whether this procurement will be executed under a DIR Cooperative contract (e.g., DBITS) or as a standalone contract?	Please see the answer to question 5.
134.	What is the expectation around RRC FTEs being involved in work orders or should respondents make the assumption that the workplan include vendor resources exclusively (e.g., RRC Project Manager, BA, etc.)?	May vary by Workorder.
135.	Can RRC clarify what differentiates a “high-scoring” Workplan submission?	Please see the answer to question 63.
136.	Can RRC please provide TXCC’s Contract Security Standards and TXCC’s Contract Data Security Standards as referenced in Compliance section under RFO Part B, Section B.5.3?	These standards are set by Texas Department of Information Resources (DIR) and the information can be found on their website .
137.	The expected details per workorder includes the name of RRC's project manager. Does RRC expect to handle PM responsibilities internally for each workorder or should the Vendor supply a PM in each workplan?	May vary by Workorder.
138.	Is RRC comfortable with vendor-provided AI solutions to accelerate delivery provided vendor seeks prior-approval from RRC?	Please see the answer to question 48.
139.	What percentage of work is expected onsite vs remote? Page 41, item 10 indicates work to be completed exclusively onsite.	Please see the answer to question 103.

140.	What AI tools are available in RRC environment today that vendors will be able to use on work orders?	Please see the answer to question 48.
141.	How will RRC evaluate pricing across deliverable-based vs hourly rate structures?	RRC will evaluate all pricing provided based on the best-value standard as set forth in Texas Government Code 2155.074.
142.	Are there liquidated damages tied to SLAs or delivery timelines?	Please see item 26 of Attachment 7, Terms and Conditions.
143.	Please provide "Attachment 11, RRC's Service Level Agreement," as referenced in RFP Part A, Section A.15." No such attachment was included in the RFO.	Section A.15 Service Level Agreement (SLA) was included in the RFO by mistake. No SLA is needed for this effort.
144.	Can RRC provide details of the Warranty referenced to be in Attachment 6 - Sample Contract? No mention of Warranty exists in Attachment 6.	The Sample Contract does contain a statement to Warranty. RRC is reliant on the vendor's expertise and would welcome the vendor providing an example of a warranty timeframe. Any warranty would be in addition to hypercare performed on vendor provided solutions.
145.	To allow for more thoughtful and complete responses to the RFO, can you provide a short extension to the due date for proposals?	Please see the answer to question 126.
146.	In regards to Attachment 3 Qualifications Statement, you are asking for bonding references. Is this a requirement?	This procurement does not require bonding. Please disregard this item on the form.
147.	Is there a bond requirement for this RFO?	Please see the answer to question 146.

148.	Should vendors address each project overview item in section B.5.3. Company Experience & Qualifications (Section C) Experience?	Yes.
149.	With regard to the minimum qualifications in section B.5.3, Company Experience & Qualifications (Section C) Experience, will you accept references/experience from Federal and County customers as well as State customers?	Yes.
150.	With regard to the requirement "Completion of at least three (3) projects, delivered by Offeror within the past three (3) years, that include delivery of information technology services and support to at least one (1) state agency, preferably providing a Salesforce application technology.", will you accept project references from the past 5 years?	No.
151.	Is there a mandatory HUB goal for this RFO? If so what percentage of the work must go to a HUB subcontractor(s)? And how many evaluation points are associated with reaching the HUB subcontracting percentage goal?	Please see the answer to question 94.
152.	Will you accept past performance/references/experience from subcontractors? Will the experience/qualifications of subcontractors/SaaS platform providers be given equal weighting to those of prime contractors?	No.
153.	Can offshore resources be used for development, if production and non-production environments that contain PII/PHI and other confidential information remain in the US and are not accessed by offshore resources, and all data remains in the US?	Please see the answer to question 65.
154.	What is the budget range/not-to-exceed cap dollar amount for this RFO?	Please see the answer to question 6.
155.	How many vendors does RRC anticipate awarding from this RFO?	Unknown at this time.

156.	Can RRC provide more detailed requirements around the initial workorder (IETRS Phase 5 Texas Damage Reporting Form (TDRF) System Replacement)?	Additional detail can be provided upon contract award.
157.	What is the anticipated start date and desired go-live date for the initial workorder (IETRS Phase 5 Texas Damage Reporting Form (TDRF) System Replacement)?	NTP may be issued as soon as the contract is awarded and all work must be completed before 8/31/2027.
158.	What is the expected annual spend range under this RFO contract?	Please see the answer to question 6.
159.	What is the current average annual spend range under the existing contract?	Please see the answer to question 6.
160.	What are expectations for training delivery—train-the-trainer, virtual, in-person, or self-service training resources?	Please see the answer to question 51.
161.	What roles are expected to be classified as critical onsite staff? What is the expected on-site cadence (full-time, kickoff only, periodic, or other)?	Please see the answer to question 103.
162.	What is the anticipated contract award date?	No later than 8/31/2026.
163.	Would RRC consider an extension of the proposal submission deadline?	Please see the answer to question 126.

164.	Can RRC confirm the current vendor(s) providing Salesforce implementation and support services under the existing contract(s)?	Please see the answer to question 121.
165.	Assuming the Commission selects more than one vendor, how many vendors does RRC anticipate awarding contracts to?	Please see the answer to question 155.
166.	In the case of a multiple vendor award, what will be the process for awarding future scopes of work?	Please see section A.22. RRC Workorder Process of the solicitation.
167.	Will all awarded vendors be invited to respond to each Workorder, or will Workorders be distributed among vendors based on specialization, capacity, or prior performance?	All of the above.
168.	Are incumbent vendors eligible and expected to participate in this solicitation?	Please see the answer to question 121.
169.	Will the initial TDRF System Replacement Workorder be awarded as part of this solicitation, or will it be competed among awarded vendors after contract award?	RRC will make the determination based on the timing of the contract award, the vendor selection, and the responses.
170.	What is the estimated budget and anticipated timeline for the initial TDRF Workorder?	Please see the answer to question 3, item C in relation to the budget and question 157 for timeline.
171.	Can RRC provide examples of “critical” roles or activities that would require onsite presence?	Please see the answer to question 103.

172.	What is the anticipated frequency and duration of onsite work for key roles?	Please see the answer to question 103.
173.	Table 2 - Hourly Rate Pricing asks for vendors to provide a blended rate for various types of services. During the course of the contract are vendors allowed to provide yearly rate escalation to account for salary increases and cost of living adjustments?	No.
174.	To clarify the experience requirement, could you please provide the RRC's definition of a "regulatory state agency?"	A "regulatory state agency" means an agency, including a department, commission, board, or office that: • is created by the constitution or by statute; • is in the executive branch of state government; • has statewide authority; and • has authority to grant, deny, renew, suspend, or revoke a license, permit, certificate, registration, or other form of permission to engage in an occupation or to operate a business.
175.	Relating to the draft workplan for the IETRS Phase 5 TDRF System Replacement, where within the response structure outlined in section B.5 should this draft workplan be included?	Please include the draft workplan as an attachment to the pricing portion of your response.
176.	Could you describe the primary data domains (e.g., Incident Details, Operator Information, Asset Details) that the TDRF system covers?	Primary data domains include: Incident Details, Operator Information, Excavator Information, Excavation Information, Underground Pipeline Information, Dockets (violation codes, fees, payments), Documents.
177.	Could you identify the source application(s) from which TDRF data and/or functionality must be migrated and provide the approximate data volume for each?	Please see the answer to question 15.
178.	Could you provide a general assessment of the source data's quality and the complexity of the business rules required for data transformation?	Please see the answer to question 15.

179.	Could you list all applications that the new TDRF system must interface with and describe the nature of each integration (e.g., real-time API, batch data transfer)?	Letter generation: Conga Composer (sync), Conga Batch (async), Xerox print service via FTP (possible API service). Document storage: Neubus (external file storage system), Mulesoft.
180.	Are there expected performance targets for the new TDRF system (e.g., daily/peak transaction volumes, concurrent users, API latency/availability SLOs)?	No peak times or consistent monthly average. Annual volume 24k (broken down to about 2000 per month). No target volume/SLO determined as of yet.
181.	Could the RRC please share its policy regarding the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in solutions developed for the agency?	Please see the answer to question 48.
182.	To assist with solution design, would the RRC be able to share any existing high-level architecture diagrams of the current environment?	This can be determined after contract award.
183.	What is the current payment gateway used for any existing electronic payments that may be relevant to this workorder?	Texas.gov, SnapPay
184.	Is there a file size limit for email submissions to the RRC that we should be aware of?	25 MB is our standard limit. If a file size is larger than that, please notify RRC so that we can make other tools available to receive submissions.
185.	The RFO references multiple Salesforce-based applications currently in production (CASES, EVENTS, PIPES, CIIS, RRC MAP) and the MINERS prototype. Can RRC confirm the Salesforce edition and cloud type currently in use (e.g., Sales Cloud, Service Cloud, Experience Cloud, Public Sector Solutions, Government Cloud Plus)? Additionally, are all existing applications deployed within a single Salesforce org or across multiple orgs, and is the expectation that the new TDRF application will be built within the same org as the existing IETRS applications?	Service Cloud - Unlimited Edition, Experience Cloud, Gov Cloud Plus w/hyperforce, Single org, yes.

186.	Will this implementation be hosted on Salesforce Government Cloud Plus (FedRAMP High)? If so, what data classification levels (as defined by TXCC) are expected to reside within the environment?	Yes. See the PDF at the end of this document for data classification information.
187.	Section A.16.1 references RAMP (Railroad Commission Access Management Process) for authenticated external user login. Can RRC provide details on the RAMP authentication mechanism currently in place (e.g., SAML, OAuth, MFA requirements)? Is RAMP already integrated with any of the existing Salesforce applications, and if so, can the same integration pattern be reused for the TDRF application?	The authentication method is SAML, RAMP is already integrated, and the same pattern can be reused.
188.	The RFO lists several integration tools and platforms, including MuleSoft, Informatica, GoAnywhere, Snowflake, Box, Neubus, Conga, JIRA, Copado, and RunMyJobs. For the TDRF application specifically (Workorder 1), the RFO references integrations with CASES, PIPES, a payment portal, and Xerox. a) Can RRC provide details on the nature of each TDRF integration (real-time API, batch/scheduled, event-driven)? b) Are MuleSoft-based integration patterns already established for the existing Salesforce applications that can be leveraged for TDRF? c) Can RRC share API documentation or interface specifications for the CASES, PIPES, and payment portal integration endpoints?	This can be provided after contract award.
189.	Is Copado already configured as the CI/CD and DevOps tool in RRC's Salesforce environment? Will the selected vendor be expected to use Copado for deployments, or is there flexibility in the DevOps toolchain? Additionally, can RRC describe the existing Salesforce sandbox strategy (number and types of sandboxes available for development, QA, staging, and UAT)?	Yes, Copado is already configured and vendor will be expected to use for deployments.
190.	Can RRC confirm whether the existing TDRF system is a custom web application (and if so, what technology stack it is built on), or does it reside on another platform? Understanding the source system architecture will be critical for planning data migration and integration approaches.	Please see the answer to question 15.
191.	Section A.16.1 identifies several letter types to be generated by the TDRF application (No Report Letter, Homeowner Letter, Final Notice, Non-Jurisdictional Letter, No Penalty Letter, docket letters, and non-compliance letters). Can RRC provide: a) The estimated monthly/annual volume of each letter type generated and number of type of	This can be provided after contract award.

	letters to be generated? b) The delivery channels expected (email, physical mail via Xerox, in-app notification, or a combination)? c) Any existing letter templates or formatting standards that must be followed?	
192.	Section A.16.1 references "Migration of Data" as part of the TDRF scope. Can RRC provide: a) The source system(s) from which data will be migrated? b) Estimated data volumes (e.g., number of historical incidents, reports, operator/excavator records, docket records)? c) Whether historical document attachments (e.g., photos, scanned documents) also need to be migrated, and if so, the estimated volume and total storage size? d) Any known data quality or cleansing needs in the source data?	Please see the answer to question 15.
193.	Section A.16.1 mentions "Submit violation payments. Implement an online payment option (enhancement)" and references integration with a payment portal. Can RRC clarify: a) What payment gateway or payment processor does RRC currently use or intend to use (e.g., Texas.gov pay portal, a third-party gateway)? b) Is the existing payment integration used by CASES and EVENTS the same integration to be leveraged for TDRF? c) What payment types are expected (credit card, ACH, e-check)?	a) Texas.gov, SnapPay, b) yes, integrations exist, c) all of the above.
194.	Section A.16.1 references "Submit multiple incident reports/mass upload (authenticated external user) - previously referred to as EDI Upload." Can RRC provide details on: a) The file formats and data standards currently used for EDI uploads? b) Expected volume and frequency of mass uploads? c) Whether validation rules or error-handling requirements exist for the mass upload process?	Can be handled with OOTB features. Alternatively, we might need to build a custom solution if Business still wants users to upload Excel.
195.	For the TDRF Workorder 1, the RFO references both core functionality and several items marked as "(enhancement)." Can RRC clarify whether the expectation is that all functionality - including the enhancements (e.g., file attachments for excavators, online payment option, CASES integration for non-compliant dockets) - be delivered within a single Workorder 1 release, or would RRC be open to a phased delivery approach within the Workorder?	Please see the answer to question 104.
196.	Can RRC provide an estimated monthly/annual volume of: a) TDRF reports (incidents and damage reports) submitted by external users (operators and excavators)? b) Number of concurrent internal users (RRC staff reviewers/analysts) who will use the TDRF application? c) Number of external authenticated users (operators) and unauthenticated	a) 1000 - 1500 per month, b) 9 internal users c) 400 - 700 authenticated (only about 5-10 operators are the main users), 1000+ unauthenticated d) four different report types.

	users (excavators/public) expected? d) Number of report types currently generated for TDRF.	
197.	What is RRC's expected or desired timeline from issuance of the Notice to Proceed (NTP) to production go-live for the TDRF Workorder 1?	Please see the answer to question 157.
198.	Section A.24 Items 10-12 state that critical project activities must be performed on-site at RRC headquarters in Austin, TX, while non-critical activities may be performed remotely within the United States. Can RRC provide further clarification on: a) What activities and/or roles does RRC anticipate designating as "critical" (e.g., requirements gathering, UAT support, deployment) versus "non-critical" (e.g., development, testing, documentation)? b) What is the estimated percentage of on-site presence expected for the vendor team? c) Are onshore resources (within the U.S. but not on-site in Austin) permitted to work on production environment tasks, or is production access restricted to on-site personnel only?	Please see the answer to question 65.
199.	Section A.12 states that payments are deliverable-based and not time and materials, as detailed in Attachment 5 Pricing Worksheet. Can RRC clarify: a) What is the net payment term upon RRC's acceptance and approval of a deliverable (e.g., Net 30)? b) For deliverables that span multiple months, are interim/milestone payments permissible, or is payment only upon full deliverable completion and acceptance?	Please see the answer to question 98.
200.	Will RRC procure and provide Salesforce licenses (including any additional platform licenses such as Experience Cloud, Shield, etc.) directly, or is the selected vendor expected to include license procurement and associated costs as part of the engagement?	Please see the answer to question 7.
201.	Does the scope include the implementation of advanced analytics or business intelligence capabilities beyond Salesforce native reporting and dashboards (e.g., Tableau CRM / CRM Analytics / Einstein Analytics)? Section A.16.1 references "internal dashboards for tracking and reporting on workload" - can RRC confirm whether native Salesforce reports and dashboards will suffice?	No advanced analytics or business intelligence capabilities are expected. Reporting requirements will be developed as part of the requirements phase.

202.	Will RRC provide access to the existing TDRF system for vendor analysis during the Workplan development phase? Additionally, can RRC make available the DIR Project Delivery Framework templates and any applicable Framework Extensions that vendor must comply with?	The selected vendor for this the TDRF work order will have access to the system and SMEs after the contract award. All DIR Project Delivery Framework templates are publicly available through the DIR website .
203.	Is there an incumbent vendor currently supporting the existing Salesforce applications (CASES, EVENTS, PIPES, CIIS, RRC MAP) or the current TDRF system at RRC? If so, will the incumbent be eligible to respond to this RFO?	Please see the answer to questions 121 and 122.
204.	How many active Salesforce user licenses does RRC currently hold, and what license edition/type are they (e.g., Enterprise, Unlimited, Platform)?	Please see the answer to question 7.
205.	What is the current state of RRC's data governance practices, including data classification maturity, as they relate to the systems being integrated with or replaced by this Salesforce implementation? Has RRC already begun TXCC data classification using Informatica CDGC, or will this be part of the engagement scope?	RRC has a data governance program in place, in alignment with SB475 requirements. We also have a data classification SOP and all new projects have to comply with these data classification requirements.
206.	Has RRC conducted any prior Salesforce assessments, solution roadmap exercises, or proof-of-concept work relevant to the TDRF or future workorder items described in this RFO? If so, can those materials be made available to offerors?	No specific assessments have been conducted.
207.	Section A.9 states that multi-vendor responses and joint ventures are permitted, and Section A.14 identifies multi-vendor coordination as a project risk. In the event multiple vendors are awarded contracts under this RFO: a) How does RRC intend to manage coordination, communication, and handoffs between vendors working on overlapping or interdependent applications (e.g., TDRF integrating with CASES/PIPES maintained by another vendor)? b) Will a single RRC Project Manager serve as the coordination point across all vendors?	Please see the answer to question 22.
208.	The RFO indicates an original contract term ending no later than August 31, 2028, with up to three (3) one-year renewal options (Section A.11). Given this timeline: a) Can RRC provide guidance on the expected sequencing of future workorders (Section A.17) relative to the TDRF Workorder 1? b) Is there a prioritized roadmap for the future workorder items (CASES enhancements,	RRC is in the process of developing the roadmap for remaining systems that will go into Salesforce.

	EVENTS, PIPES, CIIS, RRC MAP, MINERS, AFOS, Gas Utilities)?	
209.	Can RRC share the current state of the TDRF data that is slated for migrated—specifically: the source system, the data format, and the anticipated volume of historical records?	Please see the answer to question 15.



RRC Data Classification Guidelines

WHEREAS the Data Governance Council (DGC) is a standing subcommittee of the Information Technology Standing Committee (ITSC); and,

WHEREAS the undersigned agree that the following **Data Classification Guidelines** should be enacted in accordance with the ability to fulfill legislative actions of SB475, Section 5; and,

WHEREAS RRC shall execute *Data Classification requirements necessary on the initiation of any information resource or application development project*, as per the amendment of Sec. 2054.161 of Subchapter G, of the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) and create a set of best practice guidelines.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the DGC members have jointly researched, deliberated, and discussed the topic, and it is our shared agreement and recommendation that the full ITSC members should approve and promulgate these RRC Data Classification Guidelines.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED upon approval of these guidelines, the Data Governance Council shall immediately commence and, or conclude the classification of data according to these guidelines on all application projects starting with the Salesforce AFOS application and continuing with each successive RRC application project per the requirements stated herein.

ITSC Membership

Name	Title/Designation	Signature	Date
Wei Wang	Executive Director	DocuSigned by: Wei Wang A320E7878B01444...	7/20/2023
Danny Sorrells	Deputy Executive Director	DocuSigned by: Danny Sorrells 5D99A45E434042D...	7/20/2023
Kari French	Assistant Executive Director	DocuSigned by: Kari French 41785F201C814C5...	7/19/2023
Randall Collins	Assistant Executive Director	DocuSigned by: Randall Collins 77204A1F85CD45A...	7/19/2023
Jared Ware	Critical Infrastructure Division Director	DocuSigned by: Jared Ware B2234750EB5E4DB...	7/19/2023

Pamela Darden	Chief Financial Officer	DocuSigned by: <i>Pamela Darden</i> 3C25C93429DF49C...	7/19/2023
Alex Schoch	General Counsel	DocuSigned by: <i>Alex Schoch</i> 1A6ADA953034401...	7/19/2023



RRC Data Classification Guidelines

Version 1.01
Last update Date: 7/12/2023

Classification and Protection of RRC Data

Use the chart below to aid in identifying data that may require special handling.

Data Classification Taxonomy ¹			
Classification	Public Disclosure Consequences	Examples	Minimum Safeguards
<u>Confidential:</u> Very sensitive data that must be protected from unauthorized disclosure or public release based on state or federal law, (e.g., the Texas Public Information Act) and other constitutional, statutory, judicial, and legal agreements.	• Potential criminal or civil penalties • Loss of reputation • Loss of trust	• Social Security Numbers • Personally Identifiable Information, such as a name in combination with driver's license number and date of birth • Financial account info • Medical info • Industry Proprietary info	• Sending email containing confidential data to an external address is generally prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the relevant division director or Office of General Counsel. • Confidential data must not be sent via email to other RRC employees unless it is encrypted. • Limit access to those with a need to know and implement annual review of access and data classification.

¹ Data can be in more than one classification.

<u>Regulated:</u> Information that is controlled by a state or federal regulation or other 3rd party agreement	• Federal investigation or loss of right to collect revenue. • Loss of reputation • Loss of trust	• Data that meets the definition of SPI under the Texas Business and Commerce Code: • 521.002(a)(1) and 521.002(a)(2): https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/Docs/BC/h/tm/BC.521.htm • HIPAA Security (45 CFR Parts 164), • PCI DSS v2.0, • FTI, • FICA, • Tax information	• RRC interaction with the federal government or services that are regulated by federal rules and laws. In such instances, the information maintained by those agencies must comply with federal controls. • Limit access to those with a need to know and implement annual review of access and data classification. • Regulated data must not be sent via email to other RRC employees unless it is encrypted.
<u>Sensitive:</u> Agency protected data that may be subject to disclosure or release under the Texas Public Information Act, but requires additional levels of protection	• Loss of reputation • Loss of trust	• Railroad Commission operational information • Railroad Commission personnel records • Railroad Commission information security procedures • Railroad Commission research • Railroad Commission internal communications	• Sensitive Railroad Commission material transmitted over an external network must be encrypted in transit. • Limit access to those with a need to know and implement annual review of access and data classification.
<u>Public:</u> Information intended or required for public release as described in the Texas Public Information Act (Texas Government Code, Chapter 552)	• No adverse consequences	• Agency publications • Press releases • Public website	• No special handling required

All other aspects of **RFO# 455-26-1018** remain as is.

J. Reese Miller, CTCD, CTCM

Contract Manager

Phone: 512-463-6752

Email: reese.miller@rrc.texas.gov

RECEIPT OF ADDENDUM #2 OF RFO# 455-26-1018