



FAYETTEVILLE PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION

PROCUREMENT DEPARTMENT

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

Proposal Addendum

PWC Number: PWC2526078

Proposal Title: RFP Oracle Utilities Customer Cloud Service Implementation

Submission Deadline and Date: July 10, 2026 @ 3:00 pm

Addendum Number: 4

Addendum Date: June 19, 2026

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

1. Addenda acknowledgment is required within the IFB Bid Pricing Form.
2. Following are questions received about the solicitation and the SME's answers to the questions.
 - Q1.** Can PWC provide the inventory of all Reports, Integrations, and Customizations so we can respond accurately?
Proposer must complete Attachment K: Pricing and Commercial Terms. This document includes: ii. Reports, Integrations, and Customization Listing - Used to list and estimate all reports, interfaces, and custom work.
 - A1.** Summary below:
 - Reports: See Attachment B for a preliminary list of reports. More information on Spreadsheet Server reports is provided in A30, A31, and A32.
 - Integrations – 56 (current); an additional 14 with the MyMeter implementation occurring within the next few months. A complete list is available in Attachment A.
 - Customizations:
 - Algorithms – 311
 - Batches – 95
 - Service Scripts – 211
 - Q2.** Will PWC accept a project plan in Microsoft Project rather than Smart Sheets? The Provider shall create and maintain the project plan in Smart Sheets.
 - A2.** PWC wishes to use Smart Sheets for project/dashboard management. However, other options will be considered as long as the tool allows for online access to dashboards and reports.
 - Q3.** The RFP architecture diagram (page 15) identifies C2M, WACS, GIS, OMS, and SOA as systems currently integrated within the MWM environment. Are there any additional systems integrated with MWM or contributing to Field Activity data that are not reflected in the current architecture diagram?
 - A3.** No.
 - Q4.** Outside of C2M, are there any business process orchestrations currently running within MWM, or triggered by MWM events, that should be considered for scoping?
 - A4.** No.

- Q5.** How many OFS environments does the organization currently maintain?
- A5.** Prod, Test, and UAT.
- Q6.** Can we assume we will leverage your existing OFS environments and integrate CCS short-cycle work into your current OFS footprint via OIC?
- A6.** Yes.
- Q7.** How many net-new users are expected to be onboarded to OFS as part of this implementation?
- A7.** Approximately 10 users.
- Q8.** Which departments or business units will be newly included that are not currently in OFS?
- A8.** Utility Field Services.
- Q9.** Did you receive the test document we uploaded? We would like to confirm the link is functioning correctly.
- A9.** Yes, I received the test document you uploaded.
- Q10.** Should all proposal documents be uploaded as individual files, or may we submit a single folder containing all documents?
- A10.** You are not able to upload a folder, but you are able to upload a zip file.
- Q11.** Should each file name include "RFP: PWC2526078 – ORACLE UTILITIES CUSTOMER CLOUD SERVICE IMPLEMENTATION," given that there is no way to submit documents as a single, labeled package (unless a folder upload is acceptable)?
- A11.** Yes, please include the project information.
- Q12.** Are there any additional submission instructions or file naming conventions that can be provided to ensure our proposal is received correctly and completely?
- A12.** Include the name of the company within the file name.
- Q13.** You have identified objectives such as improving automation, strengthening data quality, enhancing customer experience, modernizing integrations, and reducing complexity. Can you elaborate on any specific business or operational challenges driving these objectives and which are most critical to achieve through the CCS implementation?
- A13.** Bidders should consider the stated objectives and all information contained within the scope documents when designing the implementation approach.
- Q14.** Which version is your current Oracle database that supports C2M?
- A14.** 19c Prod and UAT in OCI as DBaaS.

Q15. Is the database deployed on RAC or Exadata?

A15. No to both. Located in OCI as DBaaS.

Q16. What are the databases sizes (TB) for current production and non-production environments?

A16. Prod and non-prod environments will be roughly 12TB each at time of engagement.

Q17. In the RFP, PWC states that "The Provider shall propose and implement an AI-assisted or advanced analytics solution available within Oracle CCS and/or approved integrated platforms to support analysis". Can you please elaborate on what platforms are approved integrated platforms?

A17. PWC wishes to begin with CCS integrated, out-of-the-box capabilities first. We are open to expanding to other approaches, based on industry-standard, high-impact use cases that the bidder has successfully implemented at other organizations.

PWC currently leverages Oracle Cloud Infrastructure (OCI) and has invested in Oracle Utilities Data Insights (OUDI) for its AI and analytics capabilities and intends to maximize the value of these existing investments. However, we remain open to evaluating complementary platforms where there is a clear, demonstrable advantage aligned to specific use cases, integration needs, or business outcomes. Any consideration of alternate platforms will be driven by well-defined use cases, proven industry implementations, and tangible value beyond what is available within OCI.

Q18. Please clarify whether the RFP Attachment K pricing should include only implementation services through production stabilization/hypercare, or whether PWC would also like vendors to provide optional pricing for ongoing managed services support after project completion.

A18. No, PWC is not seeking quotes for ongoing managed services at this time.

Q19. The RFP reserves the right to award to one or more proposers. [Vendor name removed] intends to submit a standalone proposal covering only the following Attachment L service areas to work with SI/PWC: Build and Configure – Integrations/API Development (Items 4–5), Build and Configure – Report Development (Item 6), Testing (Items 72–95), Project Management for its own workstreams (Items 54–67), and Third-Party Vendor Coordination (Item 5), Post Go-Live Hypercare (item 48-51). Will PWC accept a proposal scoped to these Attachment L line items, with all other Attachment L areas (CCS configuration, data migration, OCM, training, go-live, hypercare) assumed to be delivered by a separate prime SI?

A19. The intent of this RFP is to make a single award. The prime bidder is responsible for submitting a complete application packet. The prime bidder may utilize subcontractors or partner organizations as part of their proposed solution; however, the prime vendor will remain fully responsible for managing those relationships, coordinating all project activities, maintaining the project schedule, and ensuring successful delivery of the complete solution.

Q20. For a sub-scope proposer responding only to specific Attachment L service areas, how should Attachment K (Pricing and Commercial Terms) be completed? Should [vendor name removed] populate only lines 01 (Project Management) ,10 (post Go Live

Hypercare), 14 (Integration/API Development) and 16 (Report Development) of the Services Pricing tab, mark all other lines as 'Not in Scope,' and leave the remaining tabs (Proposed Staffing, Payment Schedule) scoped accordingly?

A20. See A19.

Q21. For Attachments J and L, will PWC allow [vendor name removed] to respond only to the rows and line items within its proposed service areas — specifically the Integrations tab of Attachment J (all 38 items) and the relevant Attachment L items — and clearly mark all other rows as 'Not in Scope'? Or does PWC require all proposers to address every row in Attachments J and L, regardless of scope?

A21. See A19.

Q22. Will PWC evaluate [vendor name removed] proposal against the five scoring criteria (Business Scope Fit, Implementation Services Scope and Approach, Resource Expertise, Provider Experience, Pricing) calibrated to [vendor name removed] defined sub-scope, rather than against the full CCS implementation scope? If so, will an addendum clarify how scoring will be applied to sub-scope proposals?

A22. See A19.

Q23. Attachment L Item 4 states 'The Provider shall develop client-specific interfaces/APIs based on client-approved design.' For [vendor name removed] integration sub-scope, the design baseline will be the existing C2M integration architecture shown in Figure 1. Will PWC provide complete interface specifications — including WSDL/Swagger files, message schemas, data dictionaries, call frequencies, and payload samples — for all active SOA and OIC integrations at the start of the Design phase? Or should [vendor name removed] budget for a discovery sprint to produce this inventory?

A23. The selected bidder should be prepared to go through these SOA and OIC integrations at the start of the design phase.

Q24. Attachment L Item 5 states the Provider 'could manage third parties for integrations.' [vendor name removed] proposes to take primary responsibility for all third-party vendor coordination (NICE, Doxim, VertexOne, Catalis, Wells Fargo, Western Union, eBox, SwiftComply, Online Utility Exchange). Will [vendor name removed] be designated as the integration/Vendor coordination lead in the project governance structure, enabling direct communication with vendor technical teams without requiring all correspondence to route through a prime SI?

A24. See A19.

Q25. The RFP requires migrating all integrations from SOA to OIC (Attachment J Integration Item 1, Baseline). What is the current version of OIC deployed at PWC — Gen 2 or Gen 3 — and has OIC Gen 3 been provisioned as part of the CCS subscription?

A25. PWC is running Oracle Integration Cloud (OIC) Gen 3
Out OIC Version: 26.Q2 (26.04)
CCS has not yet been provisioned, but will use the same Gen 3.

Q26. Are there SOA integrations carrying SCADA or operational technology (OT) data — particularly the OMS/AspenTech integration — that are subject to network segmentation, real-time latency, or cybersecurity constraints that may restrict or complicate their migration

to OIC? Will those integrations require a separate security review or architecture approval process managed by PWC IT Security?

- A26.** There are no SOA integrations between the segregated SCADA network and the PWC network.
- Q27.** The Fusion-to-CCS integration (Attachment J Item 34, Baseline) covers refund processing, payment exchange, adjustments, and GL account strings. Can the specs be provided to determine if Oracle's pre-built Fusion-CCS integration accelerator can be leveraged, or will it need to be custom-built in OIC?
- A27.** The current design includes several custom processes and integrations. Vendor will need to confirm whether the accelerator supports these requirements. If it does not support the needed refund, payment, adjustment, GL, status update, and callback processes, the integration will require customization or be built in OIC.
- Q28.** The SwiftComply backflow compliance integration (Attachment J Item 35, Baseline) does not appear in Figure 1's current C2M architecture. Can PWC confirm this is a net-new integration with no existing C2M baseline, and provide available SwiftComply API documentation (endpoint catalog, authentication method, data objects, sandbox access) that [vendor name removed] will need for design?
- A28.** At this time, there is no direct system interface between C2M and SwiftComply. The current process relies on a manual data transfer workflow. Data is extracted from C2M using a custom query and staged in a spreadsheet for review. After validation, the spreadsheet is converted to CSV format and manually uploaded through the SwiftComply web portal. The SwiftComply portal requires manual authentication using a username and password.
- Q29.** For the OUDI integration (Attachment J Item 4, Baseline), which [vendor name removed] proposes to deliver as part of its integration scope: has Oracle provisioned OUDI in PWC's cloud tenancy, and will Oracle provide implementation accelerators, data model templates, or a partner delivery guide to [vendor name removed] ? What Oracle resources will be available to support the OUDI build?
- A29.** OUDI is a newly licensed platform that PWC is enabling as part of its CCS cloud migration. It is not yet fully provisioned or operational within our OCI tenancy, and its implementation will be part of the CCS project.

PWC expects the selected vendor to bring the necessary expertise to configure and operationalize OUDI, including enabling data pipelines, developing reports, and establishing a scalable and governed access control model. We expect the vendor to leverage Oracle-provided capabilities such as prebuilt pipelines, data models, and templates, where applicable, as part of the implementation.

If the vendor does not have sufficient experience with OUDI, PWC requires this to be explicitly identified in the proposal, along with an explanation of how they will engage Oracle OR other vendor resources (e.g., product teams, advisory services, or partner support) to ensure successful implementation.

Overall, PWC expects a well-defined implementation approach for OUDI, supported by appropriate expertise, accelerators, and resource planning, to ensure successful deployment and alignment with the future-state data and analytics architecture.

- Q30.** Will [vendor name removed] have direct access to the PWC OIC development and test environments for building, deploying, and unit-testing integrations? Or will all OIC deployments be mediated through a PWC IT administrator or a prime SI?
- A30.** The system integrator (SI) will have access to lower OIC environments.
- Q31.** Attachment L Item 6 states 'The Provider shall develop client-specific reports based on client requirements and approved design.' [Vendor name removed] proposes to deliver all report development within its scope, including OUDI dashboards and reports, FDI report migration, and data extract redesign. Will PWC share the current FDI report catalog — including report names, data sources, refresh frequencies, business owners, and consuming systems — as part of the RFP process?
- A31.** Currently, PWC maintains approximately:
- 126 reports managed by the Data & Analytics team (90 BI Publisher, 36 Oracle Analytics Cloud)
 - An additional set of Spreadsheet Server-based reports leveraged by business teams using direct C2M data access, typically consisting of relatively simple queries

The preliminary list of reports is included as Attachment B to support vendor analysis— particularly to assess the availability of prebuilt analytics within OUDI and CCS. This list is not exhaustive and should not be considered a finalized inventory.

PWC expects the selected vendor to take an active role in rationalizing and modernizing the reporting landscape as part of the implementation.

- Validate and finalize the complete report inventory with business stakeholders
- Retire reports that are no longer relevant in the target-state system
- Identify and develop new reports aligned with CCS capabilities and expanded data domains
- Define a structured approach for transitioning Spreadsheet Server reports, including re-pointing to CCS-compatible data sources or governed data platforms (e.g., OUDI or equivalent)

Overall, PWC expects the selected vendor to support this refinement process and recommend an optimized reporting architecture and migration strategy aligned with the future-state data and analytics platform.

- Q32.** Attachment J Integration Item 31 notes that PWC seeks a CCS-compatible solution to replace the Spreadsheet Server's direct database access for reporting. Does PWC have a preferred replacement approach — OUDI-based data access, OIC-delivered extracts to a data warehouse, or Oracle Analytics Cloud — or is [vendor name removed] expected to evaluate and recommend the optimal architecture as part of the report development scope?
- A32.** PWC is open to vendor recommendations on optimal architecture, particularly in scenarios where Spreadsheet Server cannot directly access CCS data sources. We expect proposers to evaluate and leverage Oracle Utilities Data Intelligence (OUDI) as the foundational data and analytics layer where appropriate. OUDI provides prebuilt data pipelines between CCS data sources and Oracle Autonomous Data Warehouse, and PWC prefers to maximize the use of these native capabilities.

Where the architecture supports it, PWC's preference is to utilize OUDI as the central, governed data warehouse and avoid building additional data pipelines using OIC or other tools. However, separate integration or pipeline solutions may be considered for specific

use cases, such as real-time data requirements, external system integrations, or other scenarios where OUDI-native capabilities are insufficient.

Overall, PWC expects the system integrator to recommend an architecture that minimizes complexity, leverages prebuilt Oracle capabilities, and ensures a scalable, governed, and efficient reporting and analytics environment.

Q33. Does PWC intend for OUDI to serve as the consolidated reporting and analytics layer post-implementation — replacing FDI, BlastPoint, and Spreadsheet Server — or will OUDI operate alongside existing reporting tools that continue to receive CCS data extracts?

A33. PWC does not intend for OUDI to fully replace all existing reporting and analytics tools. Instead, OUDI will operate as a core, governed analytics platform within a broader reporting ecosystem.

Fusion Data Intelligence (FDI), which is tightly aligned with Oracle Fusion data and extensible to other sources, will continue to play a key role. PWC expects OUDI and FDI to be integrated to support a cohesive and unified reporting experience across enterprise data domains.

External tools such as BlastPoint will continue to operate as downstream consumer applications, with data extracts provided from CCS or the broader data platform as required.

For Spreadsheet Server, which currently connects directly to C2M for business reporting, PWC anticipates a transition approach. Reports will need to be re-pointed to CCS-compatible or governed data sources—or re-developed where necessary—to align with the future-state architecture.

Overall, PWC expects proposers to recommend an optimal architecture that enables integration with OUDI, FDI, or Oracle-recommended best practices, while ensuring a scalable, governed, and unified reporting and analytics environment. This should also consider the various OCI-based tenancy requirements for integrations to OUDI and FDI.

Q34. For the Apogee/Brillion and BlastPoint data extract integrations (Attachment J Items 26–27, Baseline): what are the current extract file formats, field layouts, frequencies, and approximate row volumes per extract from C2M? Will PWC provide existing extract specifications from the C2M implementation?

A34. Apogee/Brillion Extract Format & Delivery: C2M generates CSV batch files, delivered via secure SFTP as a single consolidated output per run using the standard batch framework.

BlastPoint: 36 files, total data volume 4.2GB once per month in CSV format.

Data & Frequency: Files include customer, account, meter, and usage data (e.g., Meter ID, Account #, Date/Time, usage). Runs occur daily, with on-demand capability and initial historical loads (~90 days).

Volume & Specs: Supports large enterprise volumes with multi-threaded processing. Existing C2M extract specifications (FDDs) are available for vendor use.

Q35. Attachment J Finance Items 2 and 3 describe Oracle CCS AI-assisted reporting capabilities ('Could Have') — including automated dashboard assistance and AI agent capabilities for

narrative summaries and variance analysis. Should [vendor name removed] include pricing for these AI reporting features in its proposal, or present them as separately priced options? Can you elaborate if these AI features are available in CCS, or are they roadmap items?

A35. PWC expects proposers to leverage their expertise and prior implementation experience to evaluate and recommend an appropriate approach for AI-assisted reporting capabilities within Oracle CCS. Vendors should assess the current availability of these features based on Oracle CCS releases and their direct experience with Oracle/Product team and similar implementations.

Proposers should also identify any dependencies, prerequisites, or integrations required to enable these capabilities, including alignment with OUDI, Oracle Analytics, or other components within the ecosystem. While Oracle has highlighted these capabilities in its roadmap and release communications, vendors are expected to validate availability and maturity as part of their proposal.

PWC's expectation is that these features will be delivered as out-of-the-box capabilities where available, with configuration and integration support as needed. Vendors should include these AI capabilities in their proposals with clearly defined assumptions, and where appropriate, provide them as separately priced options or alternates based on their availability, maturity, and implementation complexity.

Q36. Attachment L Items 77–79 require the Provider to write and execute integration test scripts, lead integration testing, and work directly with third-party applications for integration testing. For [vendor name removed] integration sub-scope, [vendor name removed] is assuming that their scope is solely responsible for all integration test script authorship and execution (with the vendor), and a prime SI owns CCS configuration side of these integrations?

A36. See A19.

Q37. Attachment L Items 89 and 93 require use of Oracle Utilities Testing Accelerator (OUTA) for automated testing. Does PWC currently hold an OUTA license, and if so, what version is active? Are there existing OUTA test scripts from the C2M implementation that [vendor name removed] can leverage or extend for CCS integration testing?

A37. PWC has an OUTA license for C2M. Version is v6.0.0.2.1. Approximately 169 scripts that can be leveraged.

Q38. Attachment L Item 74 requires the Provider to 'test and document error handling, retry logic, replay/reprocessing procedures, and operational recovery steps for each integration.' Given that [vendor name removed] proposes to own this for all 38 integrations, I wanted to confirm if PWC has a standard error-handling documentation template/standards that they can share.

A38. PWC does not currently have a standard error-handling documentation template or prescribed standard for integrations. Bidders should propose an approach and documentation format that aligns with the specific integration design and operational requirements of each solution. The error-handling, retry, replay/reprocessing, and recovery procedures should be designed to best support the business process and technical architecture of the integration. As part of the design, we recommend implementing user-friendly notification and monitoring mechanisms for both Business and IT support teams to enable timely identification and resolution of integration issues.

Where appropriate, we also recommend leveraging Oracle Autonomous Transaction Processing (ATP) for auditing, error tracking, payload retention, and reprocessing capabilities to provide a robust operational support framework.

PWC will review and provide feedback on the proposed approach during the design phase to ensure it meets the program's operational and support requirements.

- Q39.** Attachment L Item 5 notes that the Provider 'could manage third parties for integrations.' [Vendor name removed] proposes to take full ownership of third-party vendor coordination for all integration vendors in its scope. Will PWC provide formal introductions to the technical contacts at each vendor (NICE, Doxim, VertexOne, Catalis, Wells Fargo, Western Union, eBox, SwiftComply, Online Utility Exchange) at project kickoff, along with copies of the relevant vendor contract sections that govern each vendor's obligation to support integration work?
- A39.** PWC will work with the selected vendor to ensure necessary introductions and document transfers happen within the appropriate project phase.
- Q40.** For the NICE IVR integration (Attachment J Item 20, Baseline): has PWC confirmed with NICE that their IVR platform version (v26.2) is certified or compatible with Oracle CCS for the AI-enabled capabilities described — AI Generated Call Summary, Real-Time Insights, and Live Insights (Items 58–60 of Attachment J)? If NICE has not yet completed CCS certification, will [vendor name removed] be responsible for driving that certification process with NICE, and on what timeline?
- A40.** Oracle has provided guidance on integrating Computer Telephony Integration (CTI) applications with CCS and has not explicitly identified any vendor-specific limitations. However, it has outlined the prerequisites and integration requirements necessary to enable this functionality. Vendors are expected to review the applicable Oracle CTI integration documentation and incorporate this into their assessment of feasibility and implementation approach.
https://docs.oracle.com/en/industries/utilities/customer-cloud-service/264/ccs-user-guides/Topics/C1_97CSCT_Integration-Integrating_with_a_CTI_App.html
- Q41.** For the Online Utility Exchange (OUE) credit check integration (Attachment J Item 21, Baseline): the RFP notes that PWC is transitioning away from indirect portal routing for this integration. Can PWC describe the current routing architecture and the desired target-state architecture so [vendor name removed] can assess whether this is a minor reconfiguration or a substantive re-architecture that requires OUE's active participation?
- A41.** PWC's current Online Utility Exchange (OUE) credit check integration is configured as a real-time, middleware-driven process. The Customer Information System (C2M) initiates a credit check request, which is routed through Oracle Integration Cloud (OIC). OIC performs data transformation and routing to OUE, receives the response, and returns the results to C2M for downstream processing, including creation of customer contact records and updates to Credit & Collections (C&C) data based on the returned credit decision. While OIC is the primary integration pathway, PWC's current implementation reflects transitional architecture. Existing design documentation indicates that legacy or alternate routing approaches (e.g., direct system interactions or portal-influenced response handling) may coexist with the OIC-mediated flow in certain scenarios. As a result, integration behavior may not be fully standardized across all execution paths.

The desired target-state architecture under Oracle Customer Cloud Service (CCS) is to fully standardize the OUE integration through an API-led, middleware-centric model, with OIC serving as the single integration hub. In this model, CCS will invoke OIC through configured service endpoints, and all request routing, data transformation, response processing, and error handling will be managed exclusively within OIC. This approach eliminates indirect or portal-based routing dependencies and aligns with PWC's strategy to centralize integrations and retire legacy integration patterns.

The level of effort required to achieve the target state will depend on the degree of alignment with this model:

- If the current integration is consistently executed through OIC using standardized API-based communication, the transition is expected to require configuration-level updates (e.g., endpoint alignment, data mapping adjustments, and CCS configuration).
- If legacy routing paths, alternate integration flows, or portal dependencies remain in active use, the transition may require a substantive re-architecture, including redesign of integration flows, consolidation of routing logic within OIC, and modification of interface components.

Coordination with the OUE vendor may be required if changes to interface contracts, authentication mechanisms, or routing patterns are necessary to support the target-state design.

Q42. Attachment K requires a fixed-price, phase-based payment schedule with no upfront payments, tied to deliverable acceptance. For [vendor name removed] integration sub-scope, would PWC accept a payment schedule tied to integration-specific milestones — such as: (1) Integration Architecture Design approved, (2) Integration build complete per phase and unit-tested, (3) Integration SIT sign-off, (4) UAT and parallel testing sign-off, (5) Go-Live cutover, (6) Hypercare completion — rather than requiring [vendor name removed] payments to align to the prime SI's full project phase milestones?

A42. See A19.

Q43. For Attachment K line 16 (Report Development), the scope and effort of report development is directly tied to the number and complexity of FDI reports to be migrated and OUDI reports to be built. Since the FDI report catalog has not been shared with proposers, will PWC allow [vendor name removed] to price report development on an estimated range with a defined assumption set, with a true-up mechanism after the report catalog is validated during Design?

A43. See A1 and A31.

PWC expects proposers to provide pricing based on an estimated range, supported by a clearly defined set of assumptions. These assumptions should reflect vendor experience from similar implementations and explicitly consider factors such as report complexity, reuse of Oracle-delivered and OUDI prebuilt reports, and opportunities for rationalization and consolidation.

PWC will allow for a true-up mechanism once the report catalog is validated during the planning and design phase. This validation will include confirming the full report inventory, refining requirements with business stakeholders, and aligning reporting needs with the future-state data and analytics architecture.

PWC expects the selected vendor to take an active role in rationalizing, modernizing, and optimizing the reporting landscape, rather than performing a one-to-one migration. This

- includes reducing redundancy, leveraging prebuilt capabilities, and defining an efficient, scalable approach to report development aligned with CCS and OUDI.
- Q44.** Attachment L Item 48 requires 'level 2 and 3 support for no less than 3 complete end-to-end billing cycles' during post-go-live hypercare. For [vendor name removed] integration scope, should hypercare support for integrations be priced as a fixed monthly retainer or as time-and-materials using the Rate Card?
- A44.** See A19.
- Q45.** In Attachment K's Proposed Staffing tab, should [vendor name removed] specify only the PWC resources required to support its integration sub-scope workstreams — such as integration SMEs per functional area, IT contacts per third-party vendor, and data/reporting SMEs — and leave staffing requirements for all other project areas (CCS configuration, migration, OCM, training) blank or noted as 'To be defined by prime SI'?
- A45.** See A19.
- Q46.** The RFP requires five references from CCS implementations. Since [vendor name removed] is proposing a specialist integration and reporting sub-scope, will PWC accept references from Oracle C2M or Oracle CCS engagements where [vendor name removed] delivered integration services, OIC/SOA migration, or reporting/analytics work — even if [vendor name removed] was not the prime SI for the full CCS implementation?
- A46.** PWC is seeking references for 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.
- Q47.** The RFP's evaluation criterion 'Provider Experience' (25 points) asks proposers to demonstrate CCS implementation experience. For a specialist sub-scope proposal, will PWC evaluate this criterion against [vendor name removed] depth of experience in OIC integration development, Oracle Utilities reporting and analytics (FDI, OUDI), and third-party vendor coordination on Oracle Utilities engagements — rather than against full CCS go-live experience? Will PWC evaluate key personnel qualifications against the specific sub-scope being proposed?
- A47.** See A19.
- Q48.** Can PWC provide a list of your current CEMLI (customizations, enhancements, modifications, localizations, and integrations)?
- A48.** See A1.
- Q49.** Are the CEMLI programmed in JAVA, Groovy or a combination?
- A49.** There are approximately 50 programmed in Java that will need to be converted to Groovy.
- Q50.** Is PWC currently using the new Rating Engine? If not, is the migration to the Oracle Rating engine to be included in the project scope?
- A50.** Yes, PWC uses the Rating Engine. This is how we generate TOU rates.
- Q51.** Is PWC planning to continue licensing Java for existing customizations, or is there an expectation that custom Java code will be converted to Groovy as part of the CCS Implementation?

- A51.** PWC has approximately 50 integrations that still use Java and would need to be converted to Groovy as part of the CCS implementation.

ATTACHMENT A

Integration	
Number	Name of Integration
1	Sync Request
2	Activity Create
3	Activity Cancellation
4	Activity Status Update
5	Order Creation Form MWM_C2M
6	Kubra Outage
7	Kubra Premises
8	Electric Data from GIS to OMS
9	Customers and Premises Files
10	CMEP Files
11	Get Account Information for IVR
12	Account Verification by Phone Number
13	Account Activity by Phone Number
14	Add Payment Extension
15	Stop Service
16	Validate Date for Stop Service
17	Outage Notification Opt-In/Out
18	Get Dialer Info
19	Update Customer Record
20	Create CARES Customer
21	Bill2Pay Events REST Service through Catalis IVR
22	ACH
23	Wellsfargo Lockbox Payment Files
24	Western Union Payment Files
25	Doxim Bill Files and Letters
26	Doxim Assessment File
27	Doxim Display Bill
28	ePortal B2P Payment Event
29	Adcomp EOD Payment File
30	Kiosk
31	B2P Payment and EOD Files
32	eBox Payment File
33	Biz-Tools File
34	Credit Check
35	Credit Check Results ePortal API
36	MJHARDEN
37	GEONEXUS ASSET
38	GIS Update to C2M
39	C1-FTGL
40	CM_GLSUP
41	EXTFINGL

42	GLASSIGN
43	GLDL
44	GLS
45	Customer Refunds Acknowledgement
46	Customer Refunds Cancellation
47	Create FA in C2M and Send to WACS SR
48	Cancel FA in C2M and Send to WACS SR
49	Update FA in C2M and Send to WACS SR
50	Work Order Create
51	Work Order Updated in Designer
52	Close FA in C2M and Send To WACS SR
53	Work Activity Created in WACS sent to EBS
54	Daily Meter Data Extract Integration (TESCO)
55	Meter Validation (TESCO)
56	INT001 - Customer Master Data Extract
57	INT002 - Billing Information Extract
58	INT003 - Transaction History
59	INT004 - Maintain E-Bill Preference
60	INT005 - Maintain Mailing Address
61	INT006 - Maintain Customer Information
62	INT007 - Start/Stop/Transfer
63	INT008 - Get Account Balance
64	INT009 - Payment Extension
65	INT010 - Service Requests
66	INT012 - Submit Payment
67	INT013 - Interval Usage Extract
68	INT015 - Online Utility Check
69	INT016 - Account Auto Pay
70	Customer Outage Notification Opt-Ins

KEY:

	MWM
	OMS/Kubr
	RNI
	IVR
	Vendors
	MyMeter
	GIS
	Fusion
	WACS

ATTACHMENT B

S.N	Report Name	Report Area	Source
1	Paysummary	C2M	BIP
2	Active Deposits with Pending Stopped or Closed SAs	C2M	BIP
3	Active Billing Rates	C2M	BIP
4	Area Light SA SP Report (CM_R_AL_SASP)	C2M	BIP
5	Assessment payments	C2M	BIP
6	Assessments -Arrears	C2M	BIP
7	Assessments-Accrued+Interest	C2M	BIP
8	Assessments-Adjustments.xdo	C2M	BIP
9	Assessments-Balance	C2M	BIP
10	Assessments--Balance	C2M	BIP
11	Assessments-Payment Allocation	C2M	BIP
12	Backflow Compliance	C2M	BIP
13	Bill Segments and Cancellations	C2M	BIP
14	BUDPLAN	C2M	BIP
15	C2M Monthly Bill Schedules and Related Billing Detail_w_dt	C2M	BIP
16	C2M PRD - UFS/INACTIVE_CONSUMPTION	C2M	BIP
17	C2M Reconnect Fee Multiple Premise SP Report SQL Provided by TMG Consulting	C2M	BIP
18	C2M SA Financial Details	C2M	BIP
19	C2M_Area Light Clean Up Report	C2M	BIP
20	C2M_Area Lights Report	C2M	BIP
21	C2M_FTs_Not_Frozen	C2M	BIP
22	C2M_Misc_Billable_Charges	C2M	BIP
23	C2M_Read_Dates_All	C2M	BIP
24	Cashier Transaction Data	C2M	BIP
25	CCR_CustomerContacts	C2M	BIP
26	CM_MDM_Zero_Reads	C2M	BIP
27	CM_R_ACCHOLD	C2M	BIP
28	CM_R_Active_WTR_Inactive_WW	C2M	BIP
29	CM_R_ADJ_TOTAL	C2M	BIP
30	CM_R_ALSSVAL	C2M	BIP
31	CM_R_BACCRT_APAY	C2M	BIP
32	CM_R_BCSC_No_SP_Detail	C2M	BIP
33	CM_R_BIPCHK	C2M	BIP
34	CM_R_Budget Overpayment SAs	C2M	BIP
35	CM_R_C2M_CYC_TODO_with_userid	C2M	BIP
36	CM_R_C2M_Cycle_Mismatch	C2M	BIP
37	CM_R_C2M_CYC_TODO	C2M	BIP
38	CM_R_C2M_CYC_TODO_with_userid	C2M	BIP
39	CM_R_CP_RATE_LONGSHORT_BILLS	C2M	BIP
40	CM_R_Debtcol	C2M	BIP
41	CM_R_DMSCCHG	C2M	BIP
42	CM_R_LETTERS	C2M	BIP
43	CM_R_LPC_COUNT	C2M	BIP
44	CM_R_NSF	C2M	BIP
45	CM_R_PAYSUM_CONFIRM_NO_TCID	C2M	BIP
46	CM_R_Pending Bills	C2M	BIP
47	CM_R_Pending_Start_Dep	C2M	BIP
48	CM_R_Phase_Status	C2M	BIP
49	CM_R_PWC_ACCOUNTS	C2M	BIP
50	CM_R_REFUNDQUERY	C2M	BIP
51	CM_R_SAs with Neg Values	C2M	BIP
52	CM_R_SOLAR_PANEL_SUBSCRIPTIONS	C2M	BIP

53	CM_R_PAYSUM_CONFIRM_NO_TCID.xdo	C2M	BIP
54	CM_R_SPECIAL_TAX	C2M	BIP
55	CM_R_ST SVC	C2M	BIP
56	CM_R_TAX_EXEMPT	C2M	BIP
57	CM_R_WO_Pay_w_RemBal	C2M	BIP
58	CM_R_WO_ToDo	C2M	BIP
59	CM_R_WORECV	C2M	BIP
60	Connection Discrepancies	C2M	BIP
61	CYBDD Report	C2M	BIP
62	DataMax	C2M	BIP
63	Daupler File	C2M	BIP
64	Deposits Applied	C2M	BIP
65	Electric Service Agreement Date Conflict Report	C2M	BIP
66	Field Activity Report	C2M	BIP
67	Financial Transaction Adjustments	C2M	BIP
68	Key Account Meters	C2M	BIP
69	Life Support Arrears 30 60 90 Day Report	C2M	BIP
70	Missing Reads	C2M	BIP
71	NC DHHS LIHEAP FY24	C2M	BIP
72	New 108 and 110T Customers	C2M	BIP
73	New Water Customers	C2M	BIP
74	OPEN_ORDERS	C2M	BIP
75	OverPay SAs with Positive Balance	C2M	BIP
76	Owners with no payments	C2M	BIP
77	Paid in Full	C2M	BIP
78	Pay Plans	C2M	BIP
79	Pay Plans	C2M	BIP
80	Payment Allocation	C2M	BIP
81	Pending Start Deposit	C2M	BIP
82	Pending Installs	C2M	BIP
83	Service Point Characteristic Types	C2M	BIP
84	Severance_Export	C2M	BIP
85	Sewer Only Arrears 30 60 90 Day Report	C2M	BIP
86	Start Services/Stop Services (CM_R_ST SVC)	C2M	BIP
87	Stopped Accounts-NCD	C2M	BIP
88	Water Sewer Complaints	C2M	BIP
89	Apogee File Transfers	C2M	FDI
90	Utility Study	C2M	FDI
91	Customer Enrollment	C2M	FDI
92	Age of Debt - C2M	C2M	FDI
93	C2M - All SAs	C2M	FDI
94	C2M - Bill After Intercept	C2M	FDI
95	C2M - Meter Seeder Errors	C2M	FDI
96	Life Support & Debt	C2M	FDI
97	WK_C2M_DriveThruCashCheck_Payments	C2M	FDI
98	CP Details - C2M	C2M	FDI
99	CP Reduction	C2M	FDI
100	CP Usage and Revenue - C2M	C2M	FDI
101	Usage and Revenue - C2M	C2M	FDI
102	120Water	C2M	FDI
103	120Water History	C2M	FDI
104	AR Query	C2M	FDI
105	C2M - 30 60 90 120 Day Bad Debit NSF	C2M	FDI

106	C2M - Area Lights Report	C2M	FDI
107	C2M - Collection Agency Referral Report	C2M	FDI
108	C2M - CUSTOMER CREDIT RATING	C2M	FDI
109	C2M - Customer Deposit Report	C2M	FDI
110	C2M - Estimated W & WW and Generated W & WW	C2M	FDI
111	C2M - Inactive Meters	C2M	FDI
112	C2M - Inactive Non Residential Meters	C2M	FDI
113	C2M - Key Accounts 25 60 90 Bad Debit Report	C2M	FDI
114	C2M - Meter Details	C2M	FDI
115	C2M - Pay Plan Break Report	C2M	FDI
116	C2M - TD Entries	C2M	FDI
117	C2M MyMeter	C2M	FDI
118	C2M - Measuring Component with Badge Number and Combined Multiplier	C2M	FDI
119	C2M - Measuring Component With Combined Multiplier	C2M	FDI
120	Inactive Consumption	C2M	FDI
121	Large Water Customers	C2M	FDI
122	WR - Work Order Task Management Effort	C2M	FDI
123	C2M - Meter Status Report	C2M	FDI
124	Meter List	C2M	FDI
125	Vacant Premise	C2M	FDI
126	Rates Reporting	C2M	FDI