



## FAYETTEVILLE PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION

### PROCUREMENT DEPARTMENT

<https://www.faypwc.com/bids/>

#### Bid Addendum

**PWC Number:** PWC2526078

**Bid Title:** RFP Oracle Utilities Customer Cloud Service Implementation

**Submission Deadline and Date:** June 26, 2026 @ 3:00 pm

**Addendum Number:** 1

**Addendum Date:** June 8, 2026

**Procurement Advisor:** *Shelby Lesane*  
*procurement@faypwc.com*

1. Addenda acknowledgement is required within the IFB Bid Pricing Form.
2. The solicitation is hereby modified as follows:

**M1. Submission Instructions – Paragraph 4** – Is hereby deleted and replaced as follows:

“Electronic Proposal submittals will be accepted by electronic submission via the following link:  
[PWC - RFP - Oracle Utilities Customer Cloud Services Implementation](https://faypwcmy.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/scriptuser_faypwc_onmicrosoft_com/lgAjaY5ledzxRbGRa5...)  
[https://faypwcmy.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/scriptuser\\_faypwc\\_onmicrosoft\\_com/lgAjaY5ledzxRbGRa5...](https://faypwcmy.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/scriptuser_faypwc_onmicrosoft_com/lgAjaY5ledzxRbGRa5...)”

Submittals should be labeled: RFP: PWC2526078 – ORACLE UTILITIES CUSTOMER CLOUD SERVICE IMPLEMENTATION. Late proposals will not be considered.

3. Following are questions received about the solicitation and the SME’s answers to the questions.

**Q1.** Can attachments J, K, and L be submitted as separate Excel files accompanying the proposal document, or must they be embedded/combined into a single submission file?

**A1.** Yes, attachments J, K, and L should be submitted as separate Excel files.

**Q2.** Please clarify the necessary attachments required for submission.

- The ‘Proposal Submittal Checklist’ (Attachment I) references 'Attachment B' four times as separate line items — company information, signature block, price, and addenda acknowledgment — which appear to be fields on the single-page Proposal Pricing Form on page 17 rather than four distinct documents, is that correct?
- Attachment B / 2.02 Business – Customer Service' appears throughout pages 32–74 of the RFP PDF, which conflicts with the Table of Contents identification of that same content as Attachment J: Business Scope and Efficiencies?
- Attachment I (Proposal Submittal Checklist) is included in the RFP and referenced throughout, but it is not listed among the required submission items within the checklist itself, nor is it referenced as a required deliverable anywhere in the submission instructions. Do we include attachment I (checklist) into our proposal?

**A2.** Each bullet is addressed below:

- Yes, the Proposal Submittal Checklist refers to several sections contained within Attachment B.
  - Attachment J is included as pages 32 – 55. Ignore the heading that references Attachment B on these pages.
  - No, the checklist is not required for the proposal submission. This document is provided for your reference and use only.
- Q3.** The RFP calls for CCS implementation. Throughout the RFP there is verbiage of OFS integration, but pricing asks for OFS Implementation costs. Are OUDI deployment and OFS implementation (including MWM retirement) required components within the scope of this RFP response and expected to be fully scoped and priced in the submitted proposal? Or are proposers expected to present just integration to OFS or a roadmap-aligned approach that acknowledges these (OFS and OUDI) as future-phase initiatives, with pricing and scope to be defined separately?
- A3.** Both OUDI and OFS implementation should be considered as required components for initial deployment. OFS is being priced separately for visibility.
- Q4.** Per the Reference section on page 7, it states proposers shall provide five (5) references where the company has implemented the CCS solution, preferably with organizations of similar scale and services as required by this RFP.
- Does this apply only to the prime bidder, or can a proposer pull in subs that meet this requirement?
  - Does the requirement apply only to complete and in production CCS projects and therefore rule out CCBCS qualifications and CCS projects in process and not operational?
- A4.** PWC is looking for references related to completed CCS projects by the prime bidder. However, bidders can provide other references for themselves and/or any sub that will be part of the effort as long as the work is relevant to the proposed project.
- Q5.** Per the Evaluation section on page 9, it states 20 points will be based on the business scope fit criteria. Please clarify PWC's business scope fit expectations for this award as it relates the RFP content and supporting attachments?
- A5.** Business Scope Fit will rely primarily on the bidder's response contained within Attachment B. However, information contained within any section of the proposal could be considered within this score.
- Q6.** Please clarify whether all five (5) references must be for completed Oracle CCS implementations, or whether Oracle C2M implementations of comparable size and scope may be submitted in whole or in part to satisfy the reference requirement.
- A6.** PWC is looking for references related to completed CCS projects. However, bidders can provide other references for themselves and/or any sub that will be part of the effort as long as the work is relevant to the proposed project.
- Q7.** Additionally, we respectfully request a three (3) week extension on the due date for RFP: PWC2526078 – ORACLE UTILITIES CUSTOMER CLOUD.
- A7.** PWC has reviewed the request and determined that the current proposal due date will remain unchanged.

- Q8.** Given that we have an outstanding question regarding the required scope of OFS and OUDI, would PWC consider extending the proposal due date to allow proposers adequate time to incorporate the addendum response into their submissions?
- A8.** PWC has reviewed the request and determined that the current proposal due date will remain unchanged.
- Q9.** Are there internal or external dependencies that require an 18-month duration from project initiation until deployment as specified in the RFP? Will an implementation duration of less than 18 months introduce complexities for PWC? (RFP page 10 – Award)
- A9.** PWC does not have a specific dependency requiring an 18-month implementation duration, all proposed implementation timelines will be evaluated.
- Q10.** Has PWC identified a business (non-IT) executive sponsor accountable for organizational change management outcomes? If yes, who has been designated? (RFP page 16 – Technical Approach)
- A10.** The project sponsor is ultimately responsible for all project outcomes, including OCM.
- Q11.** Will PWC commit to releasing staff for design workshops and training, and if so, what is the expected capacity? (RFP page 16 – Technical Approach)
- A11.** Yes, PWC will allow staff to attend training. The bidder should define expectations for training, to include hours required and who needs to attend (positions).
- Q12.** Does PWC anticipate any role, responsibility, or staffing changes as it adopts standard CCS processes and decentralizes select IT tasks? (RFP pages 15–16 – Technical Approach)
- A12.** PWC is open to recommendations on how to prepare for the operational transition after project go live.