



**DALLAS COUNTY  
PURCHASING DEPARTMENT**

Records Building, 500 Elm Street, Suite 5500  
Dallas, Texas 75202

**Michael Frosch  
Purchasing Director**

June 23, 2026

**ADDENDUM #2  
RFP 2026-032-7117 QUALITY ENGINEERING MANAGED SERVICES**

Whereas,

The Pricing Spreadsheet has been revised and is included with this Addendum in the BidNet solicitation documents. Respondents shall submit pricing using the revised Pricing Spreadsheet provided with this Addendum.

Whereas,

By way of this addendum, answers will be provided to the questions submitted.

Answers to questions are as follows:

Question 1: Is there a preference for local vendors?

Answer 1: There is no preference for a local vendor.

Question 2: What is the annual budget allocated for this RFP?

Answer2: This is a new contract. Therefore, no annual budget has been established at this time.

Question 3: Work will be onsite or remote?

Answer 3: The work schedule is hybrid, with four (4) days onsite at the office and one (1) day remote per week.

Question 4: Can vendor provide entire services from offshore location (outside US geography)

Answer 4: No. The vendor may not provide services from an offshore location outside the United States. All services must be provided from within the United States.

Question 5: Who are previous incumbents on this project?

Answer 5: This is a new contract. Therefore, there are no incumbent vendors.

Question 6: We kindly request a 1-2 week extension of the proposal submission deadline to ensure a thorough and high-quality response.

Answer 6: The solicitation due date has been extended through Addendum No. 1. Please refer to the addendum for the revised submission deadline.

Question 7: What is the total budget for this contract?

Answer 7: Please refer to addendum 2, question 2, "this is a new contract. Therefore, no budget has been established at this time."

Question 8: Is there an incumbent for this contract? If so, please provide the incumbent name, current contract number, duration, historical level of effort, and value of the contract.

Answer 8: Per answer to question 5, "this is a new contract. Therefore, there are no incumbent vendors."

Question 9: Will the incumbent be eligible to bid on this project?

Answer 9: Per answer to question 5, "this is a new contract. Therefore, there are no incumbent vendors."

Question 10: Can the work be performed remotely?

Answer 10: As answer 3 states, "the work schedule is hybrid, with four (4) days onsite at the office and one (1) day remote per week."

Question 11: If remote work is allowed, can a part of the work be done from outside the US such as in India?

Answer 11: Per answer 4, "No. The vendor may not provide services from an offshore location outside the United States. All services must be provided from within the United States."

Question 12: Does Dallas County currently have any QE or testing practice in place, or is this a greenfield engagement? If a practice exists, what gaps or failures are driving this RFP?

Answer 12: This is not a greenfield engagement. Dallas County has an established Quality Engineering (QE) Center of Excellence (CoE) with defined standards and practices. This RFP is being issued to support new and upcoming projects requiring additional QE services..

Question 13: How many active software development projects or product teams would the QE vendor be expected to support at any given time, and what is the anticipated project volume over the first 12 months?

Answer 13: 4-5 Capital project the vendor will be expected to support at any given time. Anticipated project volume increase at 30% velocity

Question 14: Does Dallas County have an existing test management platform or automation framework in place today, or is the vendor expected to introduce tooling from scratch?

Answer 14: Dallas County will provide the Quality Engineering (QE) and test automation tools and frameworks required for this engagement. The selected vendor is not expected to introduce tooling from scratch.

Question 15: How mature is Dallas County's current AI/agent application portfolio? Are MCP plugin testing and LLM guardrail testing needed on day one, or are these anticipated future-state requirements?

Answer 15: Dallas County AI CoE is a mature portfolio with support from partners. MCP support and testing is anticipated in future state requirements.

Question 16: Is there an expectation for any onsite presence at Dallas County facilities? If so,

how frequently and at which locations?

Answer16: As answer 3 states, “the work schedule is hybrid, with four (4) days onsite at the office and one (1) day remote per week.”

Question 17: What CI/CD platforms are currently in use? Are pipelines already established or does the vendor help build them?

Answer17: Dallas County currently utilizes Azure DevOps, GitHub, and Amazon DevOps for CI/CD activities. Existing pipelines are in place; however, the successful Vendor may be required to support the development, enhancement, and maintenance of CI/CD pipelines as needed to support project requirements.

Question 18: How many distinct test environments are maintained, and who is responsible for environment provisioning and management, is that in scope for this vendor?

Answer18: Dallas County maintains multiple test environments as required to support its operations. Test environment provisioning and management are not within the scope of this engagement and are managed by Dallas County's Infrastructure and Operations team.

Question 19: Dallas County's technology portfolio spans legacy COTS systems, custom-built applications, SaaS platforms, and emerging AI/data platforms. Does the County expect a single unified QE methodology applied across all portfolios, or should the vendor propose differentiated testing approaches tailored to each technology tier? If differentiated, which tiers are highest priority?

Answer19: The Vendor is expected to tailor its testing approach based on the County's diverse technology landscape, including legacy systems, cloud platforms, and AI-driven solutions. Testing methodologies should be adapted appropriately for each system type rather than applying a single uniform approach across all environments.

Question 20: For Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) and SaaS systems such as Salesforce and Snowflake, where the County does not control the underlying code, what is the expected scope of QE engagement, for example, configuration testing, upgrade regression testing, data validation, or integration testing only?

Answer 20: Dallas County IT expects the testing partner to coordinate and execute the efforts with our SaaS partners for configurations testing, upgrade regression, data validation and integrations.

Question 21: For legacy on-premises applications with limited automation hooks or API surfaces, does the County expect the vendor to invest in building automation frameworks from scratch, or will manual and exploratory testing remain the primary approach for those systems

Answer 21: The County expects the awarded vendor to invest in developing automation frameworks where feasible, particularly for non-standard or legacy systems that do not readily support automated testing. However, the selected vendor may also utilize manual and exploratory testing approaches when automation is not practical or cost-effective.

Question 22: For legacy on-premises applications with limited automation hooks or API surfaces, does the County expect the vendor to invest in building automation frameworks from scratch, or will manual and exploratory testing remain the primary approach for those systems?

Answer 22: Please refer to addendum 2, question 21.

Question 23: The RFP references a transition toward Agile product development and CI/CD pipelines. Can the County clarify how far along this transition is today, for example, are all product teams currently operating in Agile sprints, or are some teams still in waterfall or hybrid delivery models? The answer significantly shapes how QE integrates into each team's workflow.

Answer 23: Dallas County currently utilizes Agile delivery practices, supported by a Project Management Office (PMO) that governs and oversees delivery methodologies. QE teams are expected to embed within Dallas County Agile teams and participate as part of integrated product delivery.

Question 24: For teams that are still in transition to Agile/DevOps, will the QE vendor be expected to play an active role in helping those teams adopt Agile testing practices (shift-left, TDD, BDD), or is the QE scope limited to execution and reporting while the County manages its own Agile transformation separately?

Answer24: QE scope is limited to execution and reporting only.

Question 25: Are CI/CD pipelines currently in place for any applications today, or is pipeline buildout itself part of what the County is working toward? Understanding whether quality gates need to be embedded into existing pipelines or greenfield ones will shape our implementation timeline significantly.

Answer 25: CI/CD pipelines exist, but Dallas County need the selected vendor to define and integrate Quality Gates.

Question 26: The RFP references an API-first architecture transition. Are REST APIs being newly built as part of this initiative, or does the County have an existing API layer that needs regression and contract testing coverage? Is there an API gateway in place today, and will the vendor be expected to test at the gateway level?

Answer 26: Both REST and SOAP based endpoints are in use and we expect the vendor to support API testing including API Contract validations and testing coverages. We have API Gateway in place today and we expect the selected vendor to test end-to-end integration scenarios including API Gateways.

Question 27: For Enterprise Data Lake and Data Warehouse testing (Snowflake is referenced), does the County expect the vendor to perform data quality testing, pipeline validation, and schema regression testing as part of this engagement? If so, are there existing data quality frameworks or tools in use today?

Answer 27: Yes, we expect the selected vendor to support Data quality testing, pipeline validations and schema regressions. Yes, Monte Carlo and Snowflake related data validation tools are in use.

Question 28: Given that Dallas County is simultaneously managing a diverse existing portfolio while transitioning to modern delivery practices, does the County expect the QE vendor to propose a phased engagement model, for example, stabilizing quality on existing systems in Phase 1 while building automation and DevOps integration in Phase 2, or does the County expect full-scope managed services from day one across all portfolios?

Answer 28: Dallas County expects full scope managed services from day one across all portfolios.

Question 29: What test management platform does Dallas County currently use to manage test cases, execution cycles, and defect tracking?

Answer 29: Dallas County uses Atlassian tools for test management, execution tracking, and defect management.

Question 30: What is the current test automation coverage percentage across the application portfolio?

Answer30: Test automation coverage varies across the County's application portfolio. As a result, a single automation coverage percentage is not available.

Question 31: What automation frameworks or tools are currently in use for web, API, and mobile testing?

Answer 31: The County currently utilizes tools including Burp Suite and Atlassian products. Additional tools and frameworks may be used depending on the specific application, testing requirements, and technology environment.

Question 32: What performance and load testing tools are currently in use, and have formal performance baselines been established for critical systems?

Answer32: Dallas County currently utilizes a combination of tools within its Atlassian suite and other supporting platforms as part of its testing ecosystem. Performance testing tools and formal performance baselines are established and maintained as part of application and system-specific requirements where applicable.

Question 33: What static and dynamic security testing tools are currently integrated into the development pipeline?

Answer 33: Dallas County currently utilizes Veracode for application security testing integrated into the development pipeline. Additional static and dynamic security testing capabilities are applied as part of the County's overall security and development practices where applicable.

Question 34: What is the primary reason previous automation efforts did not achieve desired coverage targets?

Answer 34: Test automation coverage is an ongoing area of maturity for Dallas County, with priorities and coverage levels continuing to evolve based on application demand and delivery needs. The County seeks a vendor to help continue expanding and maturing its automation coverage.

Question 35: Which applications or systems in the portfolio have historically been the most difficult to automate?

Answer 35: Legacy mainframe systems have historically presented the greatest challenges for test automation due to their architecture, limited integration capabilities, and dependency on specialized testing approaches.

Question 36: What are the current baseline numbers for the KPIs listed in the RFP, specifically automation coverage, production defect leakage, and release quality scores?

Answer 36: The KPI targets identified in the RFP serve as the baseline performance expectations for this engagement. These include, but are not limited to, test automation coverage of  $\geq 80\%$  of regression testing, production defect leakage of  $\leq 5\%$ , and release quality scores of  $\geq 90\%$ .

Question 37: Does the County have existing enterprise licensing agreements with any vendors that the QE partner would be expected to work within?

Answer37: Per answer to question 5, "this is a new contract. Therefore, there are no incumbent vendors."

Question 38: Has the County conducted a QE maturity assessment previously, and if so, what maturity level was the County assessed at?

Answer 38: Dallas County has not completed a formal QE maturity assessment resulting in a defined maturity level. QE capabilities continue to evolve as part of ongoing process improvement and delivery modernization efforts.

Question 39: If an offeror is certified through NCTRCA as a Women-Owned Small Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE), would the firm be considered eligible toward meeting the 40% SBE participation goal for this solicitation? a. If this certification is not considered eligible, could you please share the approved directory to identify firms that would qualify toward meeting the 40% SBE goal for this project?

Answer 39: Part 1: The offeror must be SBE certified by one of the three (3) Dallas County Commissioners Court recognized certifying agencies(i.e. North Central Texas Regional Certification Agency(NCTRCA), Dallas Fort Worth Business Council(DFWBC), and/or Women Business Council Southwest(WBCS)) and have a local presence in Dallas County's \*Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) in order to be counted for SBE participation/utilization.\* The MSA includes the following counties: Dallas, Tarrant, Denton and Collin.

Part 2: The Office of Small Business Enterprise creates a vendor list of certified SBEs. Please send an email to the Contract Specialist and provide the work industry code(s) and a brief description of the services to be performed by the SBE firm.

Question 40: Could you please confirm whether the 40% SBE participation goal may be achieved through subcontracting with eligible certified SBE firms?

Answer 40: Yes, the subcontracting goals for this contract will be based on meeting or exceeding the minimum aspirational SBE goal of 40%.

Question 41: Is there a not-to-exceed (NTE) budget for this contract?

Answer41: Per answer to the question 7, "this is a new contract. Therefore, no annual budget has been established at this time."

Question 42: Can Dallas County clarify the expected pricing structure for the pricing spreadsheet (e.g., fixed monthly managed services fee, rate card, milestone-based, or hybrid model)?

Answer 42: The pricing spreadsheet has been updated to include Column D, which specifies the unit of measure for each line item. The unit of measure indicates the desired pricing structure for each respective item and must be used by the selected vendor when completing the pricing submission.

Question 43: The RFP states' pricing shall remain firm for the first 12 months, and annual increases may not exceed 5%. Can Dallas County clarify: • Whether increases are compounded annually, and whether CPI or another index is preferred for justification?

Answer43: The pricing spreadsheet allows vendors to provide annual pricing for the full duration of the contract. The 5% increase limitation applies to any pricing increases not originally identified in the vendor's submitted pricing to the County. The County will consider such price increase requests based on the most recent Consumer Price Index (CPI) and/or proof of a manufacturer's price increase. The County reserves the right to accept, negotiate, or reject any request for a price increase and may choose to re-solicit the contract if deemed to be in the best interest of the County.

Question 44: Pricing is weighed at 10 points in the evaluation criteria. Can Dallas County provide additional details regarding the pricing evaluation methodology?

Answer 44: The lowest priced responsible proposal receives the maximum points allowed. Points for all other proposals will be calculated using the following formula: Lowest Proposal Divided Next Lowest Price Multiplied by Points Allowed.

Question 45: In the pricing sheet, is the offeror required to provide an hourly rate in Column D – Year 1?

Answer 45: No, offerors are not required to provide hourly rates in Column D – Year 1. Dallas County IT's intent is to receive pricing based on the units of measure specified in Column D, rather than hourly pricing.

Question 46: For On-Demand Resources/Scalability, is the offeror expected to provide a blended hourly rate for additional resources as needed, or may the offeror add additional rows and columns to the pricing sheet to reflect different resource categories and rates?

Answer 46: The selected Vendor is expected to provide hourly pricing for applicable Resources/Scalability positions in Rows 38 through 46 of the Pricing Sheet, in accordance with the updated pricing spreadsheet provided.

Question 47: What are the key pain points in the current Quality Engineering landscape (e.g., defect leakage, delayed releases, high manual effort, lack of automation, environment instability)?

Answer47: Key pain points in the current Quality Engineering landscape include high manual effort and limited automation coverage, which impact overall testing efficiency and scalability.

Question 48: What is the expected timeline and roadmap to achieve the target of ≥80% automation coverage for regression testing?

Answer48: Dallas County's target timeline to achieve ≥80% automation coverage for regression testing is planned for Fiscal Year 2027, as part of the QE modernization and automation maturity roadmap.

Question 49: Are there specific compliance, regulatory, or governance standards applicable to AI/ML and LLM-based systems?

Answer49: Yes. AI/ML and LLM-based systems must comply with Dallas County's AI Policy (currently under development), along with all applicable County governance, security, privacy, and regulatory requirements.

Question 50: Budget Allocation: Has Dallas County established a maximum estimated budget, or an annual funding cap, for this 5-year Quality Engineering Managed Services contract?

Answer 50: Per answer to question number 5, "this is a new project. Therefore, no annual

budget has been established at this time.”

Question 51 Local and Veteran Preference: As a local, Dallas-headquartered firm and a certified Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB), does the County offer any evaluation preference points for local presence or veteran-owned status, in addition to the 15 points allocated for SBE?

Answer 51: No points are allocated for veteran-owned status.

The contracting/subcontracting goals for this contract will be based on meeting or exceeding the **minimum aspirational SBE goal of 40%**.

To be recognized as an SBE, firms (contractors and/or subcontractors):

- a. Must be certified as an SBE by the following County approved certification entities: North Texas Regional Certification Agency (NCTRCA), DFW Business Council (DFWBC) and/or the Women’s Business Council of Southwest (WBCS), at the time of the proposal/bid submission Other certifications are not acceptable;
- b. To be recognized by the County as a **qualified SBE firm**, as defined pursuant to Section 3 of the Small Business Act and relevant regulations, an SBE is a firm for which the gross revenues or number of employees averaged over the past three years, inclusive of any affiliates, is as defined by 13 C.F.R. Sec. 121.201; and
- c. Must also perform a commercially useful function on the project and have a local presence in Dallas County Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) in order to be counted for SBE points. The MSA includes the following counties: Dallas, Tarrant, Denton and Collin.

**The maximum number of points to be earned for the SBE criteria is 15 points.** Self-performance and subcontracting may be used to achieve the aspirational goals and earn points.

- a. Certified SBE Prime Contractor: **5 points**
- b. Subcontracting to a Certified SBE Firm: **Up to 10 Points**
  - SBE Participation Percentage between 1% and 9.99% = **2 points**
  - SBE Participation Percentage between 10% and 19.99% = **4 points**
  - SBE Participation Percentage between 20% and 29.99% = **6 points**
  - SBE Participation Percentage between 30% and 39.99% = **8 points**
  - SBE Participation Percentage meeting or exceeding 40.00% = **10 Points**

Question 52. Consortium Submissions: Is the County open to a "consortium" or Joint Venture model for this submission, provided the Prime contractor holds the appropriate SBE/HUB certifications, or does the County strictly prefer a traditional Prime-Subcontractor relationship?

Answer 52: The County intends to award this contract to a single prime vendor. The County is open to a joint venture or consortium model; however, the 40% SBE aspirational goal is based on subcontracting opportunities performed by certified SBE firms approved by one of the County’s recognized certifying agencies and maintaining a local presence within the Dallas County Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Question 53: Incumbent Vendor: Is there an incumbent vendor currently providing QA/QE services for Dallas County IT, or is this a net-new managed services practice?

Answer 53: Per answer to question 5, “this is a new contract. Therefore, there are no incumbent vendors.”

Question 54: Contract Transition: If an incumbent exists, will there be a mandated knowledge transfer period, and who will bear the cost of parallel operations during that transition?

Answer 54: Per answer to question 5, “this is a new contract. Therefore, there are no incumbent vendors.”

Question 55: Pricing Model (T&M vs. Fixed): Section XV requires firm pricing for 12 months. Given the requested "Managed Services Model" (Section II.10) that also requires "Resource capacity management," does the County prefer a Fixed Monthly Fee for a baseline core team, supplemented by a Time-and-Materials (T&M) rate card for surge capacity?

Answer 55: As stated in Answer 42, the pricing spreadsheet has been updated to include Column D, which specifies the unit of measure for each line item. The unit of measure indicates the desired pricing structure for that item.

Question 56: Annual Escalation Caps: Section XV states price increases shall not exceed 5% annually. Does this cap apply strictly to hourly T&M rates, or does it also govern the fixed managed services components?

Answer 56: As stated in Answer 43, the pricing spreadsheet allows vendors to provide annual pricing for the full duration of the contract. The 5% increase limitation applies to any pricing increases not originally identified in the vendor’s submitted pricing to the County. The County will consider such price increase requests based on the most recent Consumer Price Index (CPI) and/or proof of a manufacturer’s price increase. The County reserves the right to accept, negotiate, or reject any request for a price increase and may choose to re-solicit the contract if deemed to be in the best interest of the County.

Question 57: Tool Licensing Costs: Section II.12 lists required tools. Is the vendor expected to include the software licensing costs (e.g., JIRA, Selenium, LoadRunner, AI testing tools) within their pricing proposal, or will the County procure and provide these licenses?

Answer 57: No, Dallas County will provide the required tools and licenses. This section is intended for vendors that wish to propose additional software testing tools beyond those provided by the County. The County will provide access to tools including Selenium, JMeter, LoadRunner, DataRobot, and Burp Suite.

Question 58: Intellectual Property (IP): Upon expiration or termination of the contract, will Dallas County own the customized automation framework scripts, or does the vendor retain intellectual property rights to the core proprietary framework they bring to the engagement?

Answer 58: All intellectual property developed specifically for Dallas County under this contract will be owned by Dallas County. The selected vendor will not retain rights to County-developed deliverables; however, the selected vendor may retain ownership of any pre-existing proprietary frameworks, provided such materials are not uniquely developed for Dallas County.

Question 59. Service Level Penalties: Will the final contract include financial penalties or service credits if the vendor fails to meet the KPIs outlined in Section II.13, or are these targets considered aspirational for the first year?

Answer 59: There are no financial penalties or service credits at this time. However, Dallas

County reserves the right to include financial penalties or service credits during contract negotiations.

Question 60. Grace Period for KPIs: Will the vendor be granted a 90-to-120 day "grace period" or baseline phase at the start of the contract before KPI targets (and potential performance credits) are officially enforced? II. Delivery Model, Staffing, and Work Location

Answer 60: This is to be proposed by the Vendor based on its delivery approach. Dallas County reserves the right to negotiate and establish KPI targets, baselines, and timelines based on the Vendor's recommended approach and overall contract discussions.

Question 61. Hybrid Delivery Model: Section II.10 mentions "Hybrid delivery models." Is the County open to a model utilizing onshore leadership (in Dallas) combined with nearshore/offshore execution resources, or must 100% of the work be performed within the United States?

Answer 61: Dallas County's target timeline to achieve  $\geq 80\%$  automation coverage for regression testing is Fiscal Year 2027. Additionally, 100% of the work must be performed within the United States.

Question 62. Onsite Requirements: What percentage of the core team's time is expected to be spent onsite at Dallas County facilities versus working remotely?

Answer 62: As answer 3 states, "the work schedule is hybrid, with four (4) days onsite at the office and one (1) day remote per week."

Question 63. Workspace and Equipment: For required onsite personnel, will Dallas County provide dedicated workspaces, laptops, monitors, and network connectivity, or is the vendor expected to supply all hardware (BYOD with Mobile Device Management)?

Answer 63: Dallas County IT will provide onsite personnel with workspaces, laptop and network connectivity. The selected vendor is not allowed to BYOD due to CJIS Compliance needs.

Question 64. Background Checks: Section II.4 mentions CJIS. Will Dallas County sponsor, process, and pay for the fingerprint-based background checks required for vendor personnel accessing CJIS, or is this the vendor's financial and administrative responsibility?

Answer 64: This is the Vendor's responsibility and must be included in the overall cost of doing business with Dallas County.

Question 65. Clearance Timelines: What is the average turnaround time for a Dallas County CJIS background check? (This impacts our implementation timeline).

Answer 65: The average turnaround time for Dallas County CJIS background checks is approximately 1–2 weeks.

Question 66. Offboarding SLA: What is the County's required SLA for the vendor to notify IT security when a vendor resource rolls off the project to ensure rapid de-provisioning of access.

Answer 66: The required lead time for notifying IT Security of vendor resource roll-offs is approximately two (2) weeks to ensure timely de-provisioning of access.

Question 67: Who currently owns and manages test data (County teams, development teams, or external vendors)?

Answer 67: Dallas County IT and Vendor QE teams will jointly own and manage test data.

Question 68: Quality Engineering Strategy & Current State (Section II.1 & II.2). Application Volume: Approximately how many active applications (custom, COTS, SaaS, Mobile) will fall under the purview of this QE Managed Services contract in Year 1?

Answer 68: For the initial engagement, approximately five (5) business-critical applications are expected to be in scope for the QE Managed Services contract in Year 1.

Question 69. Current QA Maturity: Has the County previously conducted a formal QA maturity assessment (e.g., TMMi, CMMI)? If so, what is the current baseline level?

Answer 69: Please refer to addendum 2, Answer 38, which states: "Dallas County has not completed a formal QE maturity assessment resulting in a defined maturity level. QE capabilities continue to evolve as part of ongoing process improvement and delivery modernization efforts."

Question 70. Existing Test Assets: Roughly how many documented manual test cases and automated test scripts currently exist, and will the vendor be responsible for migrating these into a new test management platform?

Answer 70: Approximately 200 automated test scripts currently exist. Manual test case counts are maintained at the application level and vary by system. The vendor will be responsible for supporting migration of existing test assets into the County's designated test management platform as required.

Question 71. Methodology Standardization: Does the County currently mandate a specific software development lifecycle (e.g., SaaS, Scrum, Waterfall) across all IT teams, or will the vendor need to adapt the QE strategy to multiple differing methodologies?

Answer 71: Dallas County IT follows an Agile Scrum SDLC. The Vendor is expected to align and adapt its QE strategy to the Agile Scrum methodology used across County teams.

Question 72. Organizational Change Management (OCM): Transitioning to a strict QE model often meets resistance from existing development teams. Will Dallas County dedicate an internal OCM or leadership resource to help enforce the new quality gates among developers?

Answer 72: Yes. The Dallas County Information Technology (DCIT) Quality Engineering Center of Excellence (QE CoE) will provide resources to support and enforce quality gates across development teams.

Question 73. Agile Maturity: What percentage of the County's development teams currently operate in Agile sprints versus traditional Waterfall releases?

Answer 73: Approximately 30–40% of development teams currently operate using Agile Scrum methodologies, while the remaining teams follow hybrid or traditional Waterfall-based delivery models.

Question 74: Functional & Automation Testing (Section II.3 & II.4). Automation KPI Baseline: The RFP states a KPI of " of regression testing." What is the current percentage of automated regression coverage across the County's critical applications?

Answer 74: Approximately 10% of regression testing across County critical applications is currently automated.

Question 75. Mobile Testing Infrastructure: For mobile application testing, does the County provide a physical device lab, or should the vendor propose and price a cloud-based device

farm (e.g., BrowserStack, Sauce Labs)?

Answer 75: Dallas County expect the selected vendor to propose Mobile Testing Infrastructure, leveraging a cloud-native device farm solution.

Question 76. UAT Execution: For User Acceptance Testing (UAT) support, is the vendor strictly organizing and tracking UAT, or is the vendor expected to execute the UAT scripts on behalf of the business users?

Answer 76: The vendor will be responsible for coordination and execution of UAT scripts on behalf of the business users. The selected vendor will also be responsible for signoffs from UAT validation from business users prior to production rollout.

Question 77. API Testing Scope: Approximately what percentage of the County's architecture relies on headless microservices or APIs that will require dedicated API contract testing?

Answer 77: Dallas County IT is ramping up the modernization efforts on Microservices and Event Driven architectures. Our goal is to have 100% vendor QE coverage for all API testing.

Question 78. Data Warehouse/ETL Testing: Section I.3 mentions Snowflake and Data Lakes. Will the QE team be expected to write automated SQL/Python scripts for ETL validation, data completeness, and data migration checks?

Answer 78: Yes, Dallas County expects the selected vendor to fully support the Data quality, ETL validation and data migration checks with our Data modernization efforts.

Question 79. RPA Testing: Section II.12 mentions RPA Automation platforms. Is the vendor responsible for testing the RPA bots themselves, or is the County asking the vendor to use RPA tools to execute functional tests?

Answer 79: Dallas County expects the selected vendor to use Dallas County RPA tools to execute functional tests.

Question 80. Legacy Systems: Are there any legacy mainframe or terminal-based applications in scope for functional testing, or are all in-scope applications modern web/client-server? V. AI and Language Model Testing (Section II.3 & II.5)

Answer 80: Yes, limited Mainframes. Dallas County is looking for data quality checks only (Migration efforts are not in scope).

Question 81. Current AI Footprint: Section II.3 mentions "AI Language Models Output testing." How many AI/LLM models, RAG (Retrieval-Augmented Generation) systems, or agentic orchestrations are currently in production at the County?

Answer 81: Dallas County AI CoE is planning to use multiple LLM's and SLM's for its operations. AI LLM's and Agentic AI led efforts are out of scope for QE Vendors. We don't expect any Agentic AI Led QA efforts from our selected vendor.

Question 82. AI Guardrails: Does the County currently have a defined "AI Inference Policy" that the vendor will test against, or will the vendor be required to help author the guardrail definitions? Yes, Dallas County AI CoE has emerging AI Polices for Usage, Ethics and Compliance and QE vendors will use the guardrails defined in our AI Policy and AI Platforms.

Answer 82: Dallas County is in the process of developing its AI usage policy. The Vendor will be expected to adhere to the guardrails defined within the County's AI policies and AI platforms as they are established.

Question 83. AI Platform Ecosystem: Are the County's AI initiatives built on commercial public APIs (e.g.,

Answer 83: Yes, AI Platforms are using commercial Amazon AI Ecosystem.

Question 84: Performance & Security Testing (Section II.5 & II.6). Performance Environments: Does the County maintain production-scaled staging environments for load and stress testing, or will performance tests need to be executed in production during off-hours?

Answer 84: Yes, DCIT has dedicated non-production environments for Load and Stress Testing.

Question 85. Load Generation: Should the vendor include cloud-compute costs for generating distributed performance testing loads (e.g., simulating 10,000+ concurrent users) in the pricing proposal? 38. Chaos Testing: Section II.5 mentions "Chaos testing." Does the County currently utilize a chaos engineering tool (e.g., Gremlin, Chaos Monkey), or should the vendor propose one?

Answer 85: No. The selected vendor will utilize the County's hybrid cloud platforms for performance and chaos testing. The selected vendor may propose cloud-native chaos engineering tools, which DCIT will evaluate as part of the solution design.

Question 86. Disaster Recovery (DR) Testing: Does the scope of performance/reliability testing include executing failover scenarios to validate Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity plans?

Answer 86: Yes. All testing across the County's hybrid cloud stack includes disaster recovery and resiliency testing, including validation of failover scenarios as part of Business Continuity requirements.

Question 87. Penetration Testing: Section II.6 lists vulnerability validation. Is the QE vendor expected to conduct primary ethical hacking/penetration testing, or will the vendor validate the remediation of findings discovered by the County's dedicated InfoSec team?

Answer 87: Penetration testing is not directly in scope for the QE CoE. However, it will be a coordinated effort with the County's CSO/InfoSec teams, including support for validation of remediation as needed.

Question 88. Security Tools: Does the County currently own enterprise SAST/DAST tools (e.g., Veracode, Checkmarx), or should the vendor include these in their proposed toolchain? VII. DevOps Integration (Section II.7)

Answer 88: Yes, Dallas County IT owns enterprise SAST/DAST tools.

Question 89. CI/CD Platforms: What are the primary CI/CD platforms currently utilized by Dallas County IT (e.g., Azure DevOps, Jenkins, GitHub Actions)?

Answer 89: Dallas County currently utilizes GitHub and GitHub Actions as primary CI/CD platforms, with Harness.io planned for future implementation.

Question 90. Deployment Frequency: What is the average release frequency for the County's Tier-1 (critical) applications (e.g., multiple times a day, weekly, monthly)?

Answer 90: The average release frequency for Tier-1 (critical) applications is weekly, subject

to approved change requests (CRs).

Question 91: Pipeline Authority: Will the QE vendor have the administrative authority to configure "hard gates" in the CI/CD pipelines that automatically block builds from deploying if test coverage or security thresholds are not met?

Answer 91: No, the selected vendor is requested to coordinate with DCIT QE CoE teams to define and enforce "hard gates". DCIT will own the policy and governance for the gate compliance.

Question 92: DevOps Integration (Section II.7). CI/CD Platforms: What are the primary CI/CD platforms currently utilized by Dallas County IT (e.g., Azure DevOps, Jenkins, GitHub Actions)?

Answer 92: Please Refer to addendum 2, answer number 89.

Question 93. Deployment Frequency: What is the average release frequency for the County's Tier-1 (critical) applications (e.g., multiple times a day, weekly, monthly)?

Answer 93: Please Refer to addendum 2, answer number 90.

Question 94. Pipeline Authority: Will the QE vendor have the administrative authority to configure "hard gates" in the CI/CD pipelines that automatically block builds from deploying if test coverage or security thresholds are not met?

Answer 94: Please Refer to addendum 2, answer number 91.

Question 95. Visual Regression: Section II.7 mentions "Visual Regression testing (UI/UX Integrity)." Does the County currently license a specific visual AI tool for this (e.g., Applitools, Percy), or should the vendor propose one? VIII. Test Data and Environment Management (Section II.8)

Answer 95: No, DCIT does not have visual regression tools. The selected vendor can propose Cloud native visual regression tools to QE CoE for final selection and approval.

Question 96. Test Data Masking Tools: Does the County already utilize an enterprise data masking tool (e.g., Delphix, IBM Optim) to scrub PII/PHI/CJI from production databases before moving data to lower environments?

Answer 96: Yes, DCIT uses Cloud native tools for Data masking (AWS native tools)

Question 97. Data Refresh Responsibility: Will the QE vendor have direct database access to run data masking and refresh scripts, or will this require ticketing requests to a separate Dallas County DBA team?

Answer 97: The selected vendor will coordinate with DBA and Infrastructure Operations teams to run any scripts via Service Tickets.

Question 98. Synthetic Data Generation: Is the vendor permitted to use third-party AI or synthetic data generation tools to create realistic, non-sensitive data sets for lower environments?

Answer 98: No, the selected vendor is not permitted to use any third-party AI tools to generate synthetic data. The selected vendor can use programmatic tools (no AI) for mock data only.

Question 99. Environment Provisioning: Will the QE vendor have the access/authority to spin up ephemeral test environments using Infrastructure-as-Code (Terraform/ARM), or are all

environments static and managed by County infrastructure teams?

Answer 99: No, QE the selected vendor will collaborate with DCIT Cloud CoE, Infrastructure and Operations teams for ephemeral test environments using IaaS. QE selected vendor will not have access/authority to spin up environments.

Question 100. Production Access: Will designated members of the QE team (e.g., the QE Practice Lead) have read-only access to production environments for the purpose of troubleshooting and reproducing escaped defects?

Answer 100: Yes. Read-only access to production environments may be provided as required. Access to production environments containing CJIS data will be limited to approved CJIS-compliant resources that have successfully completed all required CJIS and FBI background clearance requirements.

Question 101: Quality Metrics, KPIs, and Governance (Section II.9 & II.13). Defect Leakage Definition: The KPI for Production Defect Leakage is . How does the County define the timeframe for an "escaped defect" (e.g., found within 30 days of release)?

Answer 101: Dallas County has not established a specific timeframe for defining an escaped defect. Any defect identified in production that should have been detected during the testing process will be considered an escaped defect. The QE CoE must be notified of all escaped defects, along with a detailed explanation and remediation plan. The selected vendor will be responsible for coordinating the resolution of escaped defects based on severity and delivering any required regression testing and fixes at no additional cost to the County.

Question 102. Test Cycle Completion: The KPI requires "95% on schedule." Will the vendor be penalized if a test cycle misses schedule due to environment unavailability or delayed code delivery from the County's development teams?

Answer 102: The selected vendor is expected to coordinate with the Dallas County's Infrastructure and Operations teams to remain on target for all KPI commitments and testing schedules.

Question 103. Dashboard Tooling: Does the County have a preferred Business Intelligence tool (e.g., PowerBI, Tableau) for the requested QE reporting dashboards, or should the vendor host the dashboard externally?

Answer 103: The selected vendor will have access to Microsoft BI for reporting and analytics and will be hosted internally by DCIT teams.

Question 104. Release Quality Score: Does the County currently have a mathematical formula for the "Release Quality Score", or is the vendor expected to define this composite metric during the first 90 days?

Answer 104: The selected vendor is expected to define "Release Quality Score" in partnership with QE CoE leadership teams in the first 90 days.

Question 105. Automation Execution Rate: The KPI lists an "Automation Execution Rate" of 70%. Is this measured by the total volume of automated test cases versus manual, or by the frequency of automated pipeline executions? X. Specific Dallas County Technical Ecosystem & Compliance

Answer 105: The "Automation Execution Rate" is measured based on the total volume of automated test cases relative to the overall test case inventory.

Question 106. ERP Transformation: Is the County currently undergoing a major ERP or HCM transformation (e.g., Oracle, Workday) that will require massive parallel-run payroll regression testing during Year 1 of this contract?

Answer 106: No. ERP transformation activities, including any associated payroll regression testing efforts, are out of scope for Year 1 of this engagement.

Question 107. Court Systems Integrations: Will the vendor be testing integration boundaries between the County's justice/court case management systems and state-level databases (e.g., Texas DPS)?

Answer 107: Yes. Testing of integration points between County justice and court case management systems and applicable state-level databases is within scope.

Question 108. HIPAA / BAA Requirements: Section II.4 mentions HIPAA. Will the vendor be required to sign a Business Associate Agreement (BAA) to test the Health and Human Services (HHS) applications?

Answer 108: Yes. A Business Associate Agreement (BAA) may be required for vendors supporting Health and Human Services (HHS) applications subject to HIPAA requirements.

Question 109. PCI-DSS Compliance: The County operates Tax and Revenue systems. Will the QE team be required to validate PCI-DSS compliance for payment gateway integrations?

Answer 109: Yes, the QE team may be required to support testing and validation activities related to PCI-DSS compliance for applicable payment processing and payment gateway integrations.

Question 110. Accessibility (ADA) Baseline: What is the current WCAG 2.1 AA compliance rate across the County

Answer 110: The County's digital systems are generally aligned with WCAG 2.1 AA accessibility standards. A formal, enterprise-wide compliance percentage is not currently tracked.

Question 111: Is the expectation to establish a dedicated centralized QE Center of Excellence (CoE), or to operate in a project-based QA delivery model?

Answer 111: The County's expectation is to operate under a project-based QA delivery model rather than establishing a centralized QE Center of Excellence (CoE).Model

Question 112: What CI/CD tools and DevOps platforms are currently in use (e.g., Azure DevOps, Jenkins, GitHub, GitLab)?

Answer 112: Please refer to addendum 2, answer 89, which states: "Dallas County currently utilizes GitHub and GitHub Actions as primary CI/CD platforms, with Harness.io planned for future implementation."

Question 113: What level of vendor responsibility is expected for security and vulnerability testing?

Answer 113: The selected Vendor is expected to maintain a high level of security in all testing activities, as some systems and data will include CJIS and HIPAA-regulated information. The Vendor will be responsible for following all applicable security, privacy, and compliance requirements during security and vulnerability testing..

Question 114: Are there existing automation frameworks, scripts, or tool investments that should be leveraged, enhanced, or re-engineered?

Answer 114: Existing automation frameworks, scripts, and QE tooling will be evaluated during onboarding and transition. The Vendor will be expected to assess current automation assets, including automated test scripts, and determine what can be leveraged, enhanced, or re-engineered as part of the overall QE strategy. CI/CD tools are separate from test automation frameworks and will be used for integration and execution support.

Question 115: What is the current size, structure, and skill composition of the Quality Engineering / QA team?

Answer 115: Dallas County currently has approximately six (6) dedicated Quality Engineering (QE) engineers. The team supports quality assurance and testing activities across County systems and applications. Specific team structure, role distribution, and skill composition may vary over time based on project requirements and operational needs. The successful Vendor shall be expected to collaborate effectively with County QE resources and provide appropriately skilled personnel to support all required testing activities.

Question 116: Can Dallas County provide an estimated scope baseline in terms of the number of applications, releases per year, and approximate testing demand (manual vs automation)?

Answer 116: Dallas County's IT testing scope is largely driven by project-based and episodic events, such as tax season, elections, regulatory changes, and other business initiatives. As a result, the County does not maintain a fixed baseline for the number of applications, annual releases, or testing volumes. However, based on current project portfolios and anticipated technology initiatives, Dallas County estimates that automated testing demand may increase by approximately 30% year-over-year. Vendors should propose scalable testing approaches capable of supporting fluctuating workloads and evolving business requirements.

Question 117: What is the current maturity level of Dallas County's Quality Engineering and automation ecosystem, including existing tools, frameworks, and CI/CD integrations?

Answer 117: Dallas County has not completed a formal QE maturity assessment resulting in a defined maturity level. QE capabilities, including tools, frameworks, and CI/CD integrations, continue to evolve as part of ongoing process improvement and delivery modernization efforts.

Question 118: Can Dallas County clarify the expected onsite, nearshore, and offshore delivery model preferences, including any minimum onsite presence expectations?

Answer 118: The County's delivery model is hybrid, with a requirement for four (4) days onsite at the office and one (1) day remote per week. No nearshore or offshore delivery model is contemplated under this engagement.

Question 119: Are there incumbent vendors currently providing QA/QE services? If yes, will there be a formal knowledge transition period and access to existing test assets, automation suites, and documentation?

Answer 119: Per answer to question 5, "this is a new contract. Therefore, there are no incumbent vendors."

Question 120: Can Dallas County provide additional details regarding the AI assurance/testing

expectations mentioned in the RFP, including current or planned AI/LLM platforms, use cases, and governance requirements?

Answer 120: Dallas County's AI assurance, testing expectations, and related governance requirements are currently under development as part of the County's AI policy. Specific AI/LLM platforms, use cases, and formal governance standards have not yet been finalized. Vendors will be expected to align with the County's established AI policy and any related security, privacy, and compliance requirements as they are defined.

Question 121: How does Dallas County envision the ownership model for test automation assets, frameworks, licenses, and reusable accelerators created during the engagement?

Answer 121: Dallas County will own the Intellectual Property (IP) for any test automation assets, frameworks, license and reusable accelerators created during the engagement.

Question 122: Can Dallas County clarify whether the KPIs outlined in the RFP (automation coverage, defect leakage, release quality metrics, etc.) are considered initial targets, contractual SLAs, or long-term transformation objectives?

Answer 122: The KPIs outlined in the RFP are intended to serve as a combination of initial performance targets, contractual service-level expectations, and long-term transformation objectives, depending on the specific metric and maturity of implementation.

Question 123: For the 40% SBE aspirational goal, does Dallas County expect participation primarily through subcontracting services, staffing augmentation, local presence, or a combination of all?

Answer 123: The prime contractor/offeror must determine which good or service from Dallas County's scope of work will be subcontracted to a certified SBE firm.

Question 124: Can Dallas County provide additional guidance on anticipated contract duration, projected annual spend, and expected scalability/ramp-up of QE services over the contract term?

Answer 124: The anticipated contract duration is five (5) years. Projected annual spend will be determined based on the proposals received and negotiated pricing. QE services are expected to scale based on County needs and delivery demand over the contract term.

Question 125: Does Dallas County envision this engagement as a build–operate–transfer model, or is the preference for a long-term managed QE services arrangement?

Answer 125: The County's preference is a Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) model for this engagement.

Question 126: What are Dallas County's top three QE transformation priorities — and how are speed to market, cost optimization, quality improvement, and compliance ranked against each other?

Answer 126: The County's top QE transformation priorities are cloud-native enablement, state-of-the-art technology standardization, and platform stability.

Question 127: What is the typical release cadence per application, and does this vary significantly across departments or systems?

Answer 127: Release cadence varies by application and across departments.

Question 128: What tools are currently in place for test management, test automation, and CI/CD pipeline execution across Dallas County's application portfolio?

Answer 128: Dallas County currently utilizes Selenium for test automation. Jira-based test management capabilities are planned for implementation. CI/CD pipeline execution is supported through existing DevOps tooling, including GitHub and GitHub Actions.

Question 129: Are there any mandated tools, preferred technology stacks, or existing enterprise license agreements that the selected vendor would be expected to work within?

Answer 129: Yes. Dallas County has established preferred technology stacks and enterprise standards that the selected Vendor will be required to align with. Specific tools and technologies will be shared as part of onboarding and governance under the County's enterprise architecture and IT standards.

Question 130: How would Dallas County characterize the current maturity and coverage of API automation, UI automation, and AI/LLM-specific testing practices?

Answer 130: Dallas County is in a maturing stage of QE capabilities. API and UI automation are currently in practice and expanding, while AI/LLM testing practices are in early stages of development

Question 131: Has Dallas County established any AI governance policies, guardrail frameworks, or responsible AI standards that would govern testing of AI-enabled systems?

Answer 131: Dallas County has not yet finalized formal AI governance or guardrail frameworks. AI/ML and LLM-based systems must comply with the County's AI policy currently under development, along with applicable governance, security, privacy, and regulatory requirements.

Question 132: What specific constraints exist around CJIS and HIPAA compliance as they relate to test environment setup, data handling, and defect management workflows?

Answer 132: CJIS and HIPAA compliance requirements apply to all relevant systems and data. Test environments, data handling, and defect management processes must adhere to applicable security, access control, and privacy requirements defined by County policies and regulatory standards.

Question 133: Are there any restrictions on offshore team members accessing test data, systems, or environments — and if so, what is the scope and basis of those restrictions?

Answer 133: All team members accessing test data, systems, and environments are required to work under a hybrid onsite model. Offshore resources are not permitted under this engagement, and all work must be performed within the United States in accordance with County security and compliance requirements.

Question 134: What is the anticipated steady-state team size for the QE engagement, and how does Dallas County expect the team composition to evolve over the contract term?

Answer 134: The anticipated steady-state team size will be determined based on the Vendor's proposed delivery approach and the evolving needs of the County's QE transformation program. The County expects the QE team composition to scale up or down over the contract term in alignment with project demand, application coverage, and automation maturity.

Question 135: Will vendor personnel be required to undergo background checks, security clearances, or any County-specific credentialing prior to project onboarding?

Answer 135: Yes. CJIS clearance is mandatory for all applicable vendor personnel prior to onboarding and access to County systems and data. Additional background checks and County-specific security or credentialing requirements may also apply in accordance with County policies.

Question 136: Are the KPIs defined in the RFP tied to financial penalties or performance incentives, and if so, what is the measurement and reporting mechanism?

Answer 136: There are currently no financial penalties or service credits associated with the KPIs at this time; however, Dallas County reserves the right to include financial penalties or service credits during contract negotiations.

Question 137: What governance and oversight structure does Dallas County expect the selected vendor to operate within — including cadence for steering committee reviews, operational reporting, and escalation protocols?

Answer 137: : The selected Vendor will operate under a governance model that includes weekly leadership updates, biweekly steering committee reviews, and regular operational reporting. Escalation protocols will be defined as part of the overall governance framework and aligned with County leadership and QE CoE processes.

Question 138: Does the County have a preferred set of tools for AI/LLM testing, or is the vendor expected to provide the entire AI testing framework and infrastructure?

Answer 138: Dallas County AI Center of Excellence will provide the guided recommendation including AI Testing Framework recommendations and Infrastructure. We expect the selected vendor to support MCP led integration testing only.

Question 139: Can Dallas County provide additional detail on the AI/LLM testing requirements, including specific systems currently in production, testing methodologies currently in use (if any), and expected maturity level for MCP plugin testing, agentic orchestration validation, and LLM guardrail testing?

Answer 139: AI/LLM testing is out of scope for QE Vendor. MCP Testing with our API and internal external partners is only in scope as part of integration testing.

Question 140: Please clarify whether Infrastructure-as-Code (IaC) validation and testing is expected within the QE scope of services.

Answer 140: Yes. Infrastructure-as-Code (IaC) validation and testing is expected to be within the QE scope of services. The selected Vendor is expected to be conversant with IaC tooling such as AWS CloudFormation and Terraform to support validation activities.

Question 141: For KPI measurement, how will Dallas County account for scenarios where legacy architecture constraints, third-party vendor dependencies, or County-owned system limitations impact testing outcomes and deliverable timelines?

Answer 141: The selected Vendor is expected to assess and document technical feasibility prior to initiating QE efforts and proactively identify architectural constraints, third-party dependencies, and County system limitations. These factors must be surfaced to County leadership and QE CoE in a timely manner to support informed governance decisions and KPI

evaluation context.

Question 142: Please clarify whether KPI penalties or service credits are associated with missed performance targets, and if so, provide details on the penalty structure and measurement methodology.

Answer 142: Ped addendum 2, answer 136: “there are currently no financial penalties or service credits associated with the KPIs at this time; however, Dallas County reserves the right to include financial penalties or service credits during contract negotiations.”

Question 143: Will Dallas County consider a phased onboarding and phased automation transformation approach over the initial 12-18 months to achieve the 80% automation coverage target, or is immediate full-scale implementation expected?

Answer 143: Dallas County is open to a phased onboarding and phased QE transformation approach over the initial 12–18 months to support achievement of the 80% automation coverage target. Immediate full-scale implementation is not required, and the approach may be structured based on the Vendor’s proposed delivery model and maturity roadmap.

Question 144: Can Dallas County provide an approximate breakdown of the 35+ ongoing and 15+ new projects by compliance category (CJIS-compliant projects requiring on-site US citizens vs non-CJIS projects allowing US-based remote resources)?

Answer 144: This information is considered sensitive and will be shared with the selected Vendor under a mutually executed NDA. A detailed breakdown of project classifications, including CJIS and non-CJIS workload distribution, will be provided during onboarding and transition planning.

Question 145: What is the expected ratio of vendor QE resources to County in-house QE engineers in the combined QE Center of Excellence operating model?

Answer 145: The anticipated staffing ratio in the combined QE operating model is 1:3, with one (1) vendor QE resource supporting every three (3) County in-house QE engineers.

Question 146: Can Dallas County clarify the FBI fingerprinting and CJIS background check process timeline for vendor resources? Will Dallas County facilitate or sponsor these clearances, or is this the vendor's responsibility?

Answer 146: CJIS certification and FBI fingerprint-based background checks are the responsibility of the Vendor for all applicable personnel. Dallas County IT will facilitate and coordinate the process in collaboration with the Vendor and the Sheriff’s Department to support onboarding and clearance processing.

Question 147: For the stated preference of UiPath as the primary UI automation tool, is Dallas County providing UiPath licenses, or should vendors include UiPath licensing costs in their proposals?

Answer 147: Dallas County IT will provide UiPath licenses. Vendors are not required to include UiPath licensing costs in their proposals.

Question 148: Given that AI-powered testing tools are not approved for QE services, can Dallas County clarify whether traditional AI/ML tools for ancillary functions (e.g., test data generation, visual regression analysis, predictive analytics for defect detection) are permissible?

Answer 148: AI-powered testing tools are not approved for QE services. Accordingly, the use

of AI/ML-based tools for ancillary QE functions (including test data generation, visual regression analysis, or predictive defect analytics) is also not permitted within the QE scope of services.

Question 149: Can Dallas County provide examples or case studies of the AI systems currently in production that will require testing to help vendors better understand the AI/LLM testing scope and complexity?

Answer 149: Dallas County does not currently provide case studies or detailed examples of AI/LLM systems for QE scoping purposes. AI/LLM testing requirements will be defined at a high level within the County's emerging AI policy, and vendors will be expected to align testing approaches accordingly.

**Except as provided herein/above, all other specification requirements of the original solicitation referenced shall remain unchanged in full force and effect. This addendum should be signed and returned with your Solicitation package on or before 7/9/2026, @ 2 PM (CST).**