

RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS

OPERATIONS DIVISION

AMENDMENT #2

DATE: 4/21/2023

SOW#: 455-23-1001

TITLE: Document Imaging and ECM Services

PROPOSAL DEADLINE: Friday, April 28, 2023, at 2:00 PM Central Time

Amendment #2:

Purpose of this Amendment is to publicize submitted questions with answers:

No.	QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
1	<p>Page 6, Section 3 Background: "The first of the secondary platforms contains additional image files RRC has stored on local file system storage. The second of the secondary platforms contains a small set of files stored on Box."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. What is the volume of Objects in each of these two secondary platforms? If unknown, what volumes for each of the secondary platforms should vendors assume for pricing purposes?ii. Will RRC require any of these Objects to be converted to another type prior to ingestion into the single storage system?iii. What are the Object format types that vendors should anticipate encountering?	<p>Upon further review, RRC has decided to remove this portion of the Background statement.</p>
2	<p>Page 7, Section 4.2 Imaging Services/Solutions: "Object's enhancement."</p> <p>Can RRC please clarify the types of enhancements required?</p>	<p>The list below serves as an example of enhancements that may be needed and is not intended to be an exhaustive list.</p> <p>Cleaning spurious pixels, Eliminating Noise, Revealing blurred details, Sharpening, Adjust contrast or highlights. Referred generally as: "Document and Image enhancement".</p>

3	Page 7, Section 4.2 Imaging Services/Solutions: “Interface with RRC systems.”	A list of systems will be provided to the awarded vendor. Vendor will interface with RRC systems via vendor created APIs.
4	Page 9, Section 4.4 ECM Software Features and Requirements: “Ability to move Object(s) into or out of longer-term lower cost archival storage programmatically.” Since this requirement is for ECM delivery via a SaaS solution and if the vendor’s SaaS solution has the ability to dynamically move Objects between the storage tiers (including archival storage), can RRC please clarify the need for this specific API feature?	Upon further review, the RRC has decided to remove the statement related to removing objects into or out of long term archival storage programmatically.
5	Page 11, Section 5 Security Requirements, 6th bullet: “Offeror’s solution shall provide geo-fence data access from select countries and IP addresses.” Can RRC please provide the list of countries?	At this time, the following countries are included in this requirement: China - Russia - Iran - North Korea - Syria -Yemen. This list may be updated in the future to meet RRC needs.
6	Page 13, Section 7 General Requirements, 13th bullet: “Shall provide the ability to store a single Object size of at least 1TB.” What is the maximum Object size to be stored?	Due to the nature of files and storage size needs continually increasing, RRC is unable to determine with any certainty a maximum file size at this time.
7	Page 14, Section 7 General Requirements, 14th, and 15th bullets: “Shall support at least 100 parent folders, or containers, or buckets, or years so that Objects can be organized for optimum storage and retrieval speed.” And “Each bucket, or folder or container shall provide for at least 10TB of data.” Since the requirement is for ECM delivery via a SaaS solution, can RRC please clarify the need to specify how Objects are organized within the repository?	After further review, the RRC has decided to remove “Shall support at least 100 parent folders, or containers, or buckets, or years so that Objects can be organized for optimum storage and retrieval speed.” and “Each bucket, or folder or container shall provide for at least 10TB of data.”.

8	<p>Page 15, Section 10 End of Engagement Transition Plan:“... such that the data migration proceeds in a reasonable time, defined as not-to-exceed eight months.”</p> <p>And</p> <p>Page 14, Section 10 End of Engagement Transition Plan: “At the request of the RRC, and within 30 days of the request, Vendor must deliver in bulk all Objects, corresponding databases, indexes, primary keys, metadata, and any other data deemed necessary by RRC,...”</p> <p>Can RRC please clarify if the requirement is 8 months or 30 days?</p>	<p>The requirements identified are two separate issues. The 8-month deadline is for delivery of the RRC data as part of the vendor’s proposal for a planned end of engagement transition.</p> <p>The 30-day time frame is intended as a contingency plan for bulk delivery of all RRC Objects, corresponding databases, indexes, primary keys, metadata, and any other data deemed necessary by RRC, in a commonly consumed format agreeable to RRC, along with a data dictionary, and any relevant information for the purposes of some possible emergency due to data ownership at no additional charge</p>
9	<p>Page 19, Section 15 Pricing, Table 2</p> <p>There is not a row for Electronic Content Management nor is there a space to include a “cost estimate for the transition of 62 TB+ of existing data from the current to two primary and two secondary platforms into a single storage system”. Can RRC please confirm that vendors are to add line item(s) for costs associated with the ECM (including any setup costs, licensing, and/or additional fees), and a line item(s) for the transition of the 62TB+?</p>	<p>Vendors are allowed to add items to the price sheet, as long as the items added are part of the Vendor’s DIR contract.</p>
10	<p>Page 27, Section 26 RRC Attachments</p>	<p>The attachments are included in the email response to these questions.</p>
11	<p>Are there any forms for the vendor to sign as part of its submission?</p>	<p>No</p>

All other aspects of the **SOW# 455-23-1001** remain as is.

J. Reese Miller, CTCM, CTCD
Contract Manager
Operations
Phone: 512-463-6702
Email: reese.miller@rrc.texas.gov