



STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION, STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY
SOLUTIONS

Request for Information #31701-03851
Amendment 3 - State Response to Vendor Questions
FOR EMERGING TECH EXPO 2026

DATE: August 5, 2026

REQUEST# 31701-03851 IS AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

1. This RFI Schedule of Events updates and confirms scheduled dates. Any event, time, or date containing revised or new text is highlighted.

EVENT		TIME (Central Time Zone)	DATE (all dates are State business days)
1.	RFI Issued		July 9, 2026
2.	Vendor Written Questions and Comments Deadline	2:00pm CST	July 16, 2026
3.	State Response to Written Questions and Comments		August 5, 2026
4.	RFI Response Deadline	2:00pm CST	August 13, 2026
5.	Selected Vendor Expo Participants Notified		August 25, 2026
6.	Selected Vendors to Provide Presentations to the State to Ensure Alignment		August 31 - September 4, 2026
7.	Emerging Tech Expo		October 1, 2026

2. State responses to questions and comments in the table below amend and clarify this RFI.

Any restatement of RFI text in the Question/Comment column shall NOT be construed as a change in the actual wording of the RFI document.

#	Page #	SOW Section	Vendor Questions	State Response
1	4	Section 2.1.a., bullet point 2	Would one unchanged educational demonstration, accompanied by an explanation of how the same workflow advances the Future of Government, Government Operations, and Technology Foundations Pathways, be treated as one Pathway response or as three Pathway responses for purposes of the response and selection process?	See RFI Section 2.1.a., bullet point 2. A proposed Expo solution that follows the same general workflow and can be applied to multiple Transformative Pathways without customization, modification, or separate Pathway-specific content will count as one (1) Pathway response toward the three (3) Pathway limit. The vendor must identify each applicable Pathway and clearly explain how the unchanged solution aligns with each identified Pathway. If the proposed solution requires customization, modification, or distinct content for one or more Pathways, each customized Pathway response will count separately toward the three (3) Pathway limit. To reduce duplication, the vendor may describe the common elements of the solution once in a clearly labeled “Common/Overarching Solution” section and cross-reference that section in each separately labeled Pathway response. Each Pathway response must clearly identify: • The applicable Pathway; • Any Pathway-specific customization, modification, or distinct content; and • The information requested in Section 6, Technical Information Form, Question 4(a)–(h), either through a direct response or a clear cross-reference to the applicable common content. The State prefers clear headings, section titles, and cross-references. Any format is acceptable provided the State can readily identify the common solution

				content, each applicable Pathway, any Pathway-specific differences and specific reference to the numbered questions found in Section 6. Informational Forms, Technical Informational Form. Recommended Formatting Example: The State recommends placing the common solution description directly under Question 4 as the Overarching Solution (the numbering convention provided is an example). Section 6, Question 4 — Common/Overarching Solution Applicable Pathways: [Pathway 1 Name] and [Pathway 2 Name] Describe the common workflow, capabilities, proposed Expo format, and other information that applies equally to each identified Pathway. 6.4.1. Pathway Response 1 — [Pathway 1 Name] a. Pathway Name [Identify the Pathway.] b. Proposed Solution and Proposed Format Refer to the Common/Overarching Solution provided under Section 6, Question 4. For Pathway 1, the following Pathway-specific customizations or modifications apply: [Describe the Pathway 1 customizations or modifications.] c.–h. Remaining Required Information Provide the Pathway-specific response to each applicable item. Where the response is the same as the Common/Overarching Solution, provide a clear cross-reference rather than repeating identical information. 6.4.2. Pathway Response 2 - [Pathway 2 Name] a. Pathway Name [Identify the Pathway.] b. Proposed Solution and Proposed Format Refer to the Common/Overarching
--	--	--	--	--

				Solution provided under Section 6, Question 4. For Pathway 2, the following Pathway-specific customizations or modifications apply: [Describe the Pathway 2 customizations or modifications.] c.–h. Remaining Required Information Provide the Pathway-specific response to each applicable item or clearly cross-reference the Common/Overarching Solution where the information is unchanged. The importance is for all proposed Pathway solutions, up to 3 per vendor, are clearly labeled, titled and defined for ease of reference. Proposal response submissions are required to reference the distinct Pathway in Section 2. Background, Table 1 and the question numbering along with associated subsection references from Section 6. Informational Forms, Technical Information Form. If responses are missing question-numbering references the State may request the submission to be revised.
2	4, 6	Section 2.1.c., Section 6. Informational Forms, Technical Information Form, question 4.g.	May respondents propose an educational technical demonstration or working session based on independently developed, operational capabilities that have not yet been commercially deployed for a government client?	Yes. Please provide details on commercial operational status and any government limitations and why they exist.
3	2, 4	Section 2 and 2.1.f.	May respondents base an educational demonstration on a publicly documented Tennessee government workflow need (for example, a need described in a published State RFI or on a public State website), using public records or clearly labeled synthetic documents, without obtaining use-case information directly from an individual	Yes.

			agency? We ask to ensure full compliance with the RFI's restriction on direct agency outreach.	
4	4, 6	Section 2.1.c., Section 6. Informational Forms, Technical Information Form, question 4.g.	For purposes of describing current maturity or readiness, does the State prefer a particular framework or terminology, such as concept, prototype, operational demonstration, pilot-ready, production-ready, or commercially deployed?	The State is seeking recommended solutions outlining current maturity and readiness through this RFI.
5	6	Section 6. Informational Forms, Technical Information Form, question 3.	If a respondent has relevant experience processing public-sector records and developing government-applicable workflows, but has not performed that work under a government contract, should that experience be identified in the requested public-sector experience section with the distinction clearly disclosed?	Yes.
6		General	What presentation duration, physical space, audiovisual equipment, internet connectivity, electrical access, and display resources are expected to be available to selected participants at the Expo?	Should your proposed solution be selected for any given Pathway, presentations, demonstrations and labs will take place in their assigned Pathway rooms and are expected to be 35-45 minutes, running simultaneously throughout the day with one presentation/demonstration per Pathway at a time. Q&A should be built into your presentation timeline. Vendors will receive a designated booth that will be first-come, first-serve. AV/IT support, internet connectivity and electrical access, will be provided for

				Pathway presentations and demos but not at dedicated vendor booths that will be located outside of Pathway rooms; it will be up to the vendor to provide any technical equipment needed to demonstrate or display their products and services at their assigned booth.
7		General	May selected participants bring and operate local computing hardware for an offline or locally processed AI demonstration, subject to Expo facility and security requirements?	Selected vendors may bring and operate local computing hardware for use at vendor-designated booths. For Pathway presentations, demonstrations and labs, the expectation will be for vendors to use State-issued computers in Pathway rooms so presented content is uploaded chronologically to avoid technical pitfalls or delays. Instructions on sending presentations/demonstrations will be communicated to selected vendors participants during their pre-Expo Virtual Alignment Demonstrations.
8		General	May a respondent use a recorded demonstration or prepared fallback materials if live connectivity, equipment, or processing conditions prevent completion of the live technical demonstration?	Yes; however, we do not anticipate a need for fallback materials as presentations will be downloaded onto State-issued computers in presentation rooms, in order of schedule, to minimize technology issues. Vendor demonstrations will be reviewed and tested by State technical teams to ensure compatibility and accuracy.
9	2, 4	Section 2 and 2.1.f.	Does the State prefer demonstrations based exclusively on Tennessee public records, or are other public-sector records and clearly labeled synthetic government documents also acceptable?	The State is seeking recommendations through this RFI. Other public-sector records and synthetic government documents are acceptable. Please identify what your proposed solution/demonstration supports.
10	6	Section 5.4.a.	Should the Enterprise Artificial Intelligence Policy (200-POL-007) and the Enterprise Information Security Policy be addressed directly within the RFI response, or are those policies provided primarily as considerations for potential future solicitations?	The Enterprise Artificial Intelligence Policy (200-POL-007) and the Enterprise Information Security Policy are provided primarily as considerations for potential future solicitations. In the RFI response, vendors should acknowledge that they have reviewed these policies and understand they will apply to any future formal engagement. However, a full, detailed compliance

				response or mapping is not expected at the RFI stage.
11	4, 6	Section 3.1., 3.2., and Section 5.6.	Does the State require or prefer a specific electronic file format (for example, PDF), filename convention, email subject line, or maximum attachment size for the RFI response?	PDF or Word document is preferred. Please include the “[Vendor Name] Response-Emerging Tech Expo_31701-03851” in both the response document and subject line of the email. Vendors should comply with the page-limit requirements detailed in Section 5.6 of the RFI. If there is a concern with file size limitations, the vendor should confirm receipt with the State contact provided in Section 3.1 one day after the proposal response due date if they have not yet received confirmation of receipt.
12	7	Section 6. Informational Forms, Technical Information Form, question 6.	If an organization is selected, could the State describe the payment process and timeline for the estimated \$500–\$1,500 conference participation fee?	Instructions on the vendor participation fee payment process will be provided to the selected vendors during the Pre-Expo Alignment Demonstrations. The participation fee will be assessed per selected vendor, regardless of how many Pathways the vendor has been selected to present or if their solution(s) includes a vendor partner.
13	6	Section 5.4.a.	Beyond the general reference to ADA requirements, what accessibility standards should apply to live demonstrations, presentation materials, and any interactive workshop content?	No other accessibility requirements apply to proposed solutions.
14		General	What is the expected length of each Pathway session at the Expo, and will sessions be repeated throughout the day or presented once?	See State response to question 6.
15		General	What AV and connectivity infrastructure will be provided at the vendor stations? Will vendors have reliable internet access for live cloud-based demonstrations, or should demos be prepared for offline/pre-recorded fallback?	See State response to questions 6, 7 and 8.
16		General	What is the expected audience composition per session	Audience Size will be dependent on attendees per Pathway, most likely 30-

			(technical staff vs. executive leadership vs. agency program managers)?	40 per session, including technical and business-focused Agency and State personnel and executive leadership representatives.
17	1, 4	Section 2 and 2.1.c.	Among the selection factors listed in Section 2.1(c) — Pathway alignment, relevance, clarity, maturity, demonstration value, responsible adoption — are any weighted more heavily than others, or are they evaluated holistically?	No. Holistic evaluation of responses is dependent on the Pathway.
18	4, 4	Section 2.1.d. and Section 4.	Section 2.1(d) references presentations between August 24 – September 3. Are these slots assigned by the State, or can vendors request preferred dates? Is there a specific format or time limit for the virtual alignment session?	See State response to questions 6. Pre-Expo Virtual Alignment Demonstrations will now be held August 31, 2026 – September 4, 2026, as specified in Amendment 2. Time slots will be assigned by the State and agenda and formatting guidelines will be communicated to the selected vendors prior to the Pre-Expo Virtual demonstration. Please allow roughly 10-20 minutes/Pathway, depending on the number of Pathways for which you are selected, to present your solution and proposed Expo presentation format.
19	1, 4	Section 2 and 2.1.c.	The RFI identifies several factors that may be considered in vendor selection, including Pathway alignment, government outcomes, use case practicality, solution maturity, demonstration value, responsible adoption, and educational engagement. Has the State established any priority among these considerations, or are they intended to be weighted equally during the evaluation and selection process?	See State response to question 17.
20		General - Conversational Volume and Scaling	Can the State provide the current annual or monthly interaction volumes (voice and digital combined) across your primary contact centers and web portals to help us estimate sizing for Citizen Self-Service use cases?	Not relevant to RFI submissions.

21		General - Ccaas Telephony and Integration	What Contact Center as a Service (CCaaS) or telephony platform is currently deployed across State agencies? How many live customer service agents utilize this platform today?	Not relevant to RFI submissions.
22		General - Data Source Integration for Search	For the 'Enterprise Knowledge Retrieval' use case, what primary data repositories (e.g., SharePoint, internal databases, public state websites) does the State intend to connect to the Search AI engine?	Not relevant to RFI submissions.
23		General - Integration Middleware	Does the State already expose central middleware, enterprise service buses, or API gateways that vendors can leverage to trigger backend tasks (like form submissions or account lookups), or should vendors expect to build direct integrations to individual agency systems?	Not relevant to submissions.
24	6	Section 5.6 and Section 6. Informational Form	Section 5.6 of the RFI states that “the cover page and a one-page introduction are excluded from the ten (10) page proposed solution response limit,” while Section 6.0 instructs respondents to complete the form provided. However, Question 3 of the form requests information that appears to be intended for the one-page introduction. Please confirm that respondents are not required to format their submission using the table or form included in the instructions, provided that all requested information is included in the proposed solution response package. For example, the information requested in Questions 1 and 2 would be provided on the cover page, outside the form and the ten-page response limit.	Confirmed. Response submissions are required to reference the question numbering along with associated subsection references within the Technical Informational Form. If responses are missing question-numbering references the State may request for the submission to be revised. The importance is for all proposed Pathway solutions, up to 3 per vendor, are clearly labeled, titled and/or defined for ease of reference. See State response to question 1 for additional Pathway response formatting recommendations.

25	4, 6	Section 2 and 2.1.c., Section 6. Information Forms, Technical Information Form, question 4.g.	Is the State seeking primarily production-proven, currently deployed solutions for each Pathway, or are prototype or pilot-stage solutions with a credible path to production also within scope for a Pathway response?	See State response to questions 2 and 4.
26	4, 6	Section 2.1.c., Section 6. Information Forms, Technical Information Form, question 4.g.	Should proposed solutions demonstrate prior public-sector or government deployment specifically, or are private-sector-proven solutions with a clearly explained rationale for government applicability equally competitive?	See State response to question 2. Public-sector deployment is not a prerequisite. All responses will be assessed based on Pathway alignment, relevance, practicality, maturity, demonstration value, responsible adoption, and educational value.
27	3	Section 2. Table 1.	Within a single Pathway that lists several recommended focus areas, such as Pathway 3 covering AI agents, digital twins, predictive governance, and enterprise knowledge together, should a vendor's response concentrate on one focus area in depth, or address multiple focus areas within that Pathway at a lighter level?	Focus on one area in depth is preferred.
28	2 thru 4	Section 2, Table 1 and Section 2.1.f.	Beyond the recommended focus areas already listed in Table 1, will the State be sharing more specific agency use cases, problem statements, or priority areas that vendors should target within each Pathway?	Vendors should be prepared to provide all demonstration content.
29	7	Section 6. Information Forms, Technical Information Form, question 6.	Beyond the conference participation fee referenced in Item 6 of the Information Form, is there an expectation that selected vendors provide any additional complimentary services, assessments, or proof-of-concept work as part of Expo participation?	No.

30	1, 5	General, Section 2. and Section 5.1. and 5.2.	Following the Expo, does the State anticipate specific follow-on procurement activity, such as a Request for Proposal or pilot engagement, with vendors whose Pathway responses are well received, or is Expo participation itself considered the primary opportunity for vendors?	The Expo is the primary opportunity contemplated by this RFI. The State has not committed to any specific follow-on solicitation, pilot, or other procurement activity. After the Expo, agencies may pursue further engagement with vendors whose proposed solutions align with their strategic initiatives and objectives, in accordance with applicable procurement policies. Expo participation does not guarantee a future solicitation, pilot, or contract award, consistent with Sections 5.1 and 5.2 of the RFI.
31	5, 6	General, Section 5.4	Given the data residency requirements in Section 5.4, does the State have a preference for solutions demonstrated at the Expo to be deployed within a State-managed environment, a vendor-hosted SaaS model, or is the deployment model considered out of scope for this stage of engagement?	It could be any of these options.
32		General	What is the expected duration and format for an individual vendor's Expo session, and does this vary depending on whether the proposed format is a presentation, a technical demonstration, or a working session?	See State response to question 6. No one presentation style or format is recommended or preferred over another; we want to understand the vendor's capabilities in the capacity for which they've submitted their proposed Pathway response.
33		General	What is the expected composition of attendees for a given vendor session, such as a mix of technical staff and agency leadership or primarily one or the other, so sessions can be pitched at the appropriate level?	See State response to question 16.

34		General	Is there an existing State-standard cloud platform, AI platform, or technology environment that vendors should assume as the integration target for proposed solutions, or should responses remain platform-agnostic at this stage?	You can recommend any platform.
35	1, 4	Section 2 and 2.1.c.	What is the selection and scoring criteria that will be used to select a vendor response considering the three transformation pathway versus a single transformation pathway?	See State response to question 17. The number of Pathways addressed in a vendor's proposal will not provide an advantage or disadvantage in the selection process. Selection will be based on the quality, relevance, and alignment of the proposed solution with the applicable Pathway and the objectives of the Expo.
36	1, 4	Section 2 and 2.1.c.	If a vendor decides to only participate in one or two tracks out of the five pathways, what are their chances of still getting selected to the next phase?	See State response to questions 17 and 35.
37	1, 2, 4, 6	Section 2, 2.1.c. and 2.1.d., Section 6. Informational Forms, Technical Information Form, question 4.b.	During the expo day, can a topic of the same track be presented by multiple partners in different sessions at different times?	Yes.
38		General	In order to better tailor our proposed sessions, could you share the expected personas of the event attendees, specifically those from state and local governments? What is the anticipated breakdown of leadership, operational staff, and IT staff?	See State response to question 16.

39		General	What is the length of each session?	See State response to question 6.
40		General	What is the expected number of attendees per session?	See State response to question 16.
41		General	What audio/visual equipment will be provided in each session space, and what are vendors expected to bring? Specifically, will there be a projector or display screen, HDMI/USB-C connectivity, and on-site audio (speakers and microphones)?	See State response to question 6. Yes.
42		General	What approximate session duration, audience size, venue format, and expected level of technical depth should respondents assume for proposed presentations, technical demonstrations, working sessions, or other Expo experiences?	See State response to questions 6, 16 and 32.
43	1 – 4, 6	Section 2 and Section 6. Technical Information Form, questions 4.b. and 4.d.	Does the State have preferred attendee profiles or anticipated user groups for each Transformative Pathway?	See State response to question 16.
44	4	Section 2.1c. and 2.1.d.	Because emerging technology solutions often span multiple disciplines (AI, data, cybersecurity, cloud, infrastructure, application integration, and governance), a complete and educational demonstration may benefit from participation by specialized technology providers or subject-matter experts. May a respondent include supporting OEMs, software providers, or other technology partners in its proposed Expo experience?	Yes. Yes. Yes. There will be a 4-person vendor and/or partner representative limit. Further details regarding this topic will be shared with selected Expo participants.

			If so: Should all supporting organizations and their roles be identified in the response? May multiple presenters or technical subject-matter experts participate in the alignment presentation and Expo session?	
45	2, 4, 5	Section 2, 2.1.f. and Section 5.4.	May respondents use clearly identified synthetic or fictional government data, documents, personas, policies, and agency scenarios to demonstrate government-relevant use cases, provided they are not represented as official State requirements or approved agency use cases?	See State response to questions 3 and 9.
46	2, 4, 5	Section 2, 2.1.f. and Section 5.4.	Will the State provide any governed, de-identified, or synthetic data for selected demonstrations, or should vendors provide all demonstration content?	See State response to question 28.
47	5, 6	Section 5.4. and Section 6. Information Form, Technical Information Form, questions 4.b., 4.c., 4.e., 4.f., 4.g..	For purposes of the RFI response and Expo demonstration, does the State expect respondents to identify a specific production deployment model and detailed integration architecture, or may respondents present a representative architecture that demonstrates the use case and responsible-adoption controls and could be adapted to State-approved environments following additional discovery?	No.
48	4, 6	Section 2.1.c. and Section 6. Information Form, Technical Information Form, question 4.g.	What criteria will the State use to assess proposed AI demonstrations and solution maturity?	See State response to question 17.

49	1, 2, 4, 6	Section 2.1.c. and Section 6. Informational Form, Technical Information Form, question 4.f.	Will evaluation include factors such as grounding and accuracy, privacy and accessibility, AI-specific security, human oversight, auditability, and operational readiness?	Yes. See State response to question 17.
50	2 thru 4, 6	Section 2, Table 1: Pathways 2 and 3, Section 2.1.c. and Section 6. Informational Form, Technical Information Form, question 4.f.	For agentic or multi-step workflows, does the State have preferred human-approval or risk-based oversight patterns that respondents should address?	No. The State does not prescribe a single approval pattern and is looking for recommendations through this RFI. Responses should explain human oversight and risk controls appropriate to the workflow of the proposed solution. Human oversight is included in the Enterprise Artificial Intelligence Policy 200-POL-007.
51	4, 6	Section 2.1.e. and Section 5.6.	Response format: Does the ten-page proposed solution response limit include the completed Technical Informational Form, architecture or data-flow diagrams, screenshots, workflow illustrations, tables, presenter biographies, and incorporated reference materials? May any supporting material be included in an appendix outside the ten-page limit?	Supporting materials may be included as an appendix outside the ten-page limit solely to provide additional detail regarding the proposed overall solution(s); however, the State is not obligated to review or consider any additional materials beyond what is required, as defined in Section 5.6. Accordingly, all relevant information necessary to understand and evaluate the proposed solution must be included within the ten-page response. The State will focus its review on the quality, relevance, and alignment of the proposed solution with the applicable Pathway and Expo objectives.
52	4 thru 6	Section 2.1.d., Section 4. and Section 5.5.	Alignment expectations: For selected vendors, must the pre-Expo virtual alignment presentation include a functioning demonstration environment, or will conceptual material, architecture views, and a demonstration storyboard be acceptable? May the	The Pre-Expo Virtual Alignment Demonstration can contain conceptual materials, architecture views and/or storyboards, but a functioning environment demonstration is preferred. Any new material that has not been reviewed and approved by the State may not be presented at the Expo.

			proposed session be refined following the alignment presentation, provided the final experience remains consistent with the selected Pathway and proposed outcomes?	The State reserves the right to request a separate functioning demonstration prior to the Expo event.
53	1, 4	Section 2 and 2.1.c.	Evaluation criteria and weighting. Beyond the factors listed in Section 2.1(c), is there a scoring rubric or ranked weighting the State will use to evaluate Pathway responses?	No. See State response to question 17.
54	4	Section 2.1.c.	Selection size and Pathway balance. Approximately how many vendors will be selected in total, and is there a target number per Pathway to ensure balanced representation across the five Pathways?	There is not a targeted number for vendor participants as selection and number of vendors will depend on the quantity and quality of proposed responses relevant to each Pathway.
55	4, 5, 7	Section 2.1.a. and 2.1.c., Section 5.6 and Section 6. Informational Form, Technical Information Form, question 5.	Partner and OEM content within a response. Are prime vendors permitted to include partner/OEM ecosystem content (ISV, hardware, or systems-integrator partners) within the 10-page response, and does joint content require separate vendor registration?	Yes. No.
56	4, 6	Section 2.1.d., 2.1.e., and Section 5.6	Page-limit scope. Does the 10-page limit include appendices, architecture diagrams, case-study visuals, references, and the Section 6 informational form, or are those excluded like the cover page and one-page introduction?	See State response to question 51.
57	6	General and Section 5.6.	Links to external demo content. Are embedded links, QR codes, or references to externally hosted videos and interactive demos permitted, and will evaluators review that linked content as part of scoring?	See State response to question 51.
58	2	Section 2 and General	Expo formats and demo logistics. What Expo formats are available to selected vendors	See State response to questions 6 and 32. Pathway demonstrations, working

			(keynote, breakout, booth, working session, hands-on lab), and what power, network, floor-space, and connectivity accommodations will the Nashville venue provide for physical demonstrations?	sessions and labs will be available to selected vendors. There will be networking opportunities in between sessions at vendor exhibit booths for demonstrations and hands-on instruction, if time permits and the vendor provides the necessary technical equipment.
59	2, 7	Section 2. Table 1: Pathway 2, and Section 6. Information Form, Technical Information Form, question 4h.	Physical AI demonstrations. Are live drone, robotics, or autonomous-system demonstrations permitted on or near the venue, and does the State handle FAA/local coordination or is that the vendor's responsibility? Is the State more interested in production-deployed Physical AI or forward-looking prototype capabilities?	The State will provide this information to selected vendors.
60	1, 6	General, Section 2. and Section 6. Information Form, Technical Information Form, question 4.d.	Audience composition. How many attendees are expected, and can STS share the anticipated breakdown by agency, role (executive, technical, operational), and whether local government (city/county) representatives will attend, so vendors can tailor content appropriately?	See State response to question 16.
61	4	Section 2.1.a.	Multi-Pathway response structure. For a response covering two or three Pathways, does the State prefer one integrated narrative with clearly labeled sections, or separate mini-responses for each Pathway?	See State response to question 1.
62	4, 6	Section 2 and 2.1.c., Section 6. Information Forms, Technical Information Form, question 4.g.	Solution maturity evidence. For the required description of current maturity or readiness, what level of evidence is the State looking for: concept, prototype, pilot, production deployment, or public-sector reference implementation?	See State response to questions 2 and 4.

63	4, 6	Section 2.1.c. and Section 6. Information Form, Technical Information Form, question 4.f.	Responsible adoption depth. How much detail does the State expect on governance, security, privacy, accessibility, ethics, and data integrity, and is there a preferred format for presenting that information?	All of these topics are very important to the State. No.
64	5	Section 5.4.	Data-residency constraints for demonstrations. For the pre-Expo alignment presentation and Expo demonstrations, should vendors assume only synthetic or sample data may be used, with no live or production-like State data?	Yes.
65	5	Section 5.4.	Section 5.4 requires that any proposed services or products keep State data onshore and within the United States. For purposes of the Expo demonstration itself, can the State confirm that this requirement applies to any future production engagement rather than to the Expo demonstration environment, which vendors expect to run on synthetic or sample data rather than live State data?	Yes. State data security requirements, including those mentioned in Section 5.4 of the RFI, are provided primarily as mandatory requirements for potential future solicitations. In the RFI response, vendors should acknowledge that they have reviewed these policies and understand they will apply to any future formal engagement when using State data. However, a full, detailed compliance response or mapping is not expected at the RFI stage.
66	6	Section 6. Information Form, Technical Information Form, question 4.g.	Several Pathways (e.g., Technology Foundations, Public Safety) reference cybersecurity and critical-infrastructure protection. Does the State require or prefer that proposed solutions hold a specific security authorization (e.g., FedRAMP, StateRAMP) to be eligible for a Pathway response, or is authorization status simply one factor considered as part of	No authorization status is required for proposed solutions at the expo.

			solution maturity (Section 6, Item 4g)?	
67		General	For each of the five Pathways, will there be multiple sessions throughout the day in the same room for each Pathway?	See State response to question 6.
68	4, 6	Section 2.1.a., bullet point 2, Section 6 Informational Forms, Technical Information Form, question 4.	I see that we can submit session proposals for up to three Pathways. If we believe we have compelling info to share, can we propose multiple session proposals within the <u>same</u> Pathway?	Yes, as long as it does not exceed the 3-proposal Pathway per vendor response limit.
69	4, 6	Section 2.1.a., bullet point 2, Section 6 Informational Forms, Technical Information Form, question 4.	Can we submit multiple unique responses to outline each of our technical partner solutions?	Yes. Vendors may submit up to 3 proposed Pathway solution responses. Any cooperative partners (e.g., NASPO prime vendors) may submit up to 3 proposal responses for each vendor partner.
70	4, 6, 7	Section 2.1.a., bullet point 2, Section 6 Informational Forms, Technical Information Form, questions 4 and 5	Should we have each technology provider submit their own response addressing the pathways directly to the State?	Vendors can submit separate responses directly or in partnership with any cooperative agreement partners or vendors partners with which their proposed solution(s) are available. Please be sure to communicate any cooperative agreements in place for their proposed Pathway solutions, as requested in Section 6.5 should they submit directly.
71		General	If a vendor is selected to participate in the Emerging Tech Expo on October 1, will there be a limit on the number of team members who may attend in person?	Yes. See State response to question 44.

72	4	General, Sections 2.1.c. and 2.1.d.	Will vendors have an opportunity to deliver a presentation or product demonstration during the Emerging Tech Expo on October 1? If so, what is the allotted time for each presentation or demonstration?	See State response to question 6 and reference Sections 2.1.c. and 2.1.d. of the RFI.
73	4	Section 2.1.a. and 2.1.c.	If a vendor submits responses for all three pathways, can the vendor be selected for participation in multiple pathways, or is selection limited to a single pathway per vendor?	Yes.
74	4, 6	Section 3.1. and 3.2. and Section 5.6.	What file format should responses be submitted in (PDF or Word), is email to this address the required channel, and will the State confirm receipt?	See State response to question 11.
75	4, 6	Section 2.1.e. and Section 5.6.	To confirm: is the ten-page limit a single cumulative limit across all selected Pathways (not per Pathway), and are the cover page and one-page introduction the only items excluded from that count?	Yes. See State response to question 51 and reference Section 2.1.e. and Section 5.6.
76	4, 6	Section 2.1.e., Section 5.6. and Section 6. Informational Forms, Technical Information Form, question 3.	Are there any required templates or formatting expectations for the cover page and one-page introduction beyond the Technical Information Form in Section 6?	No. See State response to question 24.
77	4, 6	Section 2.1.a. and Section 6. Informational Forms, Technical Information Form, question 4.	For a single solution that aligns to multiple Pathways, should it be presented once with the alignment explained for each Pathway (counting as one response per Section 2.1.a), or as separate labeled sections?	See State response to question 1.

78	4	Section 2.1.b.	Under Section 2.1.b, will solutions proposing capabilities beyond the recommended focus areas be evaluated on equal footing, provided Pathway alignment and outcomes are clearly explained?	Yes.
79	5	Section 5.4.	Does the U.S. data-residency and onshore-access requirement apply to the Expo engagement itself — which appears to be educational/demonstration-only with no State production data — or only to any future procurement that may result?	See State response to questions 64 and 65. Not for the expo itself, but this is a required security standard that is applicable for any procurement opportunities with the State.
80	5	Section 5.4.	For on-site demonstrations, is the use of synthetic/non-production data sufficient to satisfy this policy?	Yes.
81		General	What session formats and durations should vendors plan for (e.g., mainstage presentation, breakout/working session, demonstration booth), and what A/V and network connectivity will the State provide?	See State response to questions 6, 32 and 58.
82		General	Approximately how many attendees, and which agency roles, are expected overall and per Pathway, so vendors can calibrate content depth and audience?	See State response to question 16.

83	7	Section 6. Informational Forms, Technical Information Form, question 6.	Is the participation fee (\$500–\$1,500) mandatory for all selected vendors, and how and when is the specific amount determined and invoiced?	Yes. See State response to question 12.
84	4, 6	Section 2.1.e. and Section 5.6.	Page limit scope: Section 2.1.e states a strict 10-page limit "regardless of responding to one, two, or three Pathways." Does this mean 10 pages total across all submitted pathways, or 10 pages per pathway response?	See State response to questions 51 and 75.
85	4	Section 2.1.c.	Section 2.1.c references a "limited number" of vendor partners. Can the State indicate roughly how many vendors will be selected overall, and whether selection is capped per Pathway or across the Expo as a whole?	Vendor Selection is dependent on the quality, relevance, and alignment of the proposed solution with the applicable Pathway and the objectives of the Expo. There is no defined cap.
86	2	Section 2. Table 1. Pathway 2	Physical AI weighting for Pathway 2: Public Safety's recommended focus areas emphasize drones, robotics, and computer vision hardware. For vendors proposing software/data/cybersecurity solutions without a physical AI component, will responses be scored equivalently, or is a physical AI element effectively required for this Pathway?	The State is seeking recommendations through this RFI that are applicable to Pathway 2. The solution should describe the proposed technology and functionality in detail.
87	1, 4	Section 2 and 2.1.c.	Selection criteria weighting: Section 2.1.c lists several evaluation factors (Pathway alignment, maturity, demonstration value, responsible adoption, etc.). Is there a relative priority or weighting among these factors,	See State response to question 17.

			or are they considered holistically?	
88	2, 4, 5	Section 2, 2.1.f. and Section 5.4.	Demo data: Since vendors are prohibited from contacting agencies for use-case examples, can the State clarify whether demonstrations should use synthetic/mock data, generic (non-Tennessee) public-sector examples, or will any sample datasets/scenarios be provided to selected vendors?	See State response to questions 3, 9, 46 and 80.
89		General	Session format and time: For selected vendors, what is the expected duration and format of the Expo Day session on October 1 (e.g., dedicated breakout slot, booth/demo table, shared track)?	See State response to questions 6 and 32.
90	4, 5	Section 2.1.d. and Section 4.	Pre-Expo alignment presentation: Is the virtual alignment presentation (Aug 24–Sept 3) expected to mirror the Expo Day content exactly, or can it be a condensed/different format used purely for confirming fit?	Pre-Expo Virtual Alignment Demonstrations will now be held August 31, 2026 – September 4, 2026, as specified in Amendment 2. These demonstrations are to confirm alignment with agency and Pathway objectives. It will be a condensed version of your proposed Pathway solution for which a vendor is selected, strategically outlining exactly what will be presented, in what format, using what technology. An agenda will accompany the meeting invite to set expectations.
91		General	Recording/IP: Will vendor sessions or demonstrations be recorded by the State, and if so, how will that content be used or shared afterward?	To be determined and communicated to selected Expo participants.
92	7	Section 6. Informational Forms, Technical Information	Cooperative agreement relevance: Does the availability (or unavailability) of a proposed solution on a cooperative purchasing vehicle (NASPO,	That is purely informational for future procurement planning. We do recommend vendors register with the State of Tennessee for future procurement opportunities, as well.

		nal Form, Question 5.	GSA, etc.) factor into Expo vendor selection, or is that purely informational for future procurement planning?	Please see Supplier Registration information in the following links: Supplier Information Supplier Registration Instructions.pdf
93	4, 6	Section 2.1.a., 2.1.e. and Section 5.6.	Multiple submissions from one entity: If a single proposed solution genuinely requires distinct customization for two Pathways (per Section 2.1.a), should each customized version be submitted as a fully separate 10-page-eligible response, or is there a shared-content allowance to avoid redundant boilerplate?	See State response to questions 1, 51 and 75. To be clear, the TOTAL RFI response page limit is 10 pages; not 10 pages for each proposed Pathway solution.
94	1 - 4	General and Section 2.	For proposed working sessions or demonstrations, should vendors design content primarily for executive decision-makers, agency program leaders, technical teams, or a mixed audience of state and local government participants?	Mixed. See State response to question 16.
95	3	Section 2 and Section 2. Table 1: Pathway 5: Technology Foundations	For Pathway 5, Technology Foundations, will the State give preference to responses that align explicitly with Tennessee's Enterprise Artificial Intelligence Policy 200-POL-007 and Enterprise Information Security Policy?	No. See State response to questions 10 and 17.
96	3, 6	Section 2. Table 1: Pathway 5 and Section 5.4.a.	For responses involving AI governance, responsible AI, or workforce AI readiness, is the State seeking frameworks and readiness methods only, or should vendors also include sample implementation artifacts such as checklists, governance workflows, training maps, or readiness assessments?	The State is seeking recommendations through this RFI based on the vendor's proposed Pathway solution response, describing format, technology and functionality in detail; governance is key.

97	2, 3	Section 2 and Section 2. Table 1: Pathway 3: Future of Government	For Pathway 3, Future of Government, may a vendor propose a demonstration centered on human-supervised AI agents, enterprise knowledge capture, and decision intelligence, even if the demonstration uses a controlled/synthetic government scenario rather than live State data?	Yes.
98	3	Section 2. Table 1, Pathway 4: Government Operations	For Pathway 4, Government Operations, would an educational demonstration showing how AI can reduce administrative burden through meeting intelligence, research support, document review, and workflow triage be considered responsive if it emphasizes responsible use, human oversight, and non-production examples?	Yes.
99	4	Section 2.1.a.	Can a single proposed solution response be structured around one integrated model of responsible AI adoption and then mapped across Pathways 3, 4, and 5, provided the response clearly explains the alignment to each Pathway?	Yes. See State response to question 1.
100	4, 6	Section 2 and 2.1.c., Section 6. Informational Forms, Technical Information Form, question 4.g.	For maturity/readiness, how should early-stage or emerging solutions be presented when the vendor has a working demonstration, framework, or pilot-ready model but not yet a large-scale public-sector deployment?	See State response to questions 2 and 4.

101	2, 4, 6	General, Section 2, Section 2.1.d. and Section 6. Information Form, Technical Information Form, question 4.b.	Will selected Expo vendors be expected to provide hands-on attendee participation, live demonstration, lecture-style presentation, panel participation, or will the final format be determined during the pre-Expo alignment presentation?	See State response to questions 6 and 32. The State is seeking recommendations through this RFI based on the vendor's proposed Pathway solution response, describing format, technology and functionality in detail.
102	2, 4	Section 2 and 2.1.c.	Are vendors permitted to include brief case examples from education, workforce development, nonprofit, or private-sector environments if those examples are used to illustrate transferable public-sector lessons rather than to market a product?	Yes.
103	5	Section 5.4.	For security and data residency, if a vendor demonstration uses only synthetic, fictional, or publicly available data with no State data processed, stored, transmitted, or accessed, are any additional security attestations required at the RFI response stage?	No.
104	6	General, Section 6. Information Form, Technical Information Form, question 1.	Should respondents include SDVOSB/VOSB, small business, or Tennessee-based supplier status in the one-page introduction or only in the respondent information section?	Yes. It would be preferred that this information is included as part of the Respondent Legal Entity Name in the Technical Information Form found in Section 6.1. of the RFI.
105	7	Section 6. Information Forms, Technical Information Forms, question 6.	If selected vendors are asked to pay the estimated \$500–\$1,500 participation fee, will that fee be due before the pre-Expo alignment presentation or closer to the October 1 event date?	See State response to question 12.

106	4	Section 2.1c. and 2.1.d.	Can vendors submit solutions jointly with one or more teaming partners for one or more solution offerings?	See State response to question 44.
107	7	Section 6. Informational Forms, Technical Information Forms, question 6.	Is the estimated participation fee of \$500–\$1,500 assessed per submitted solution, or once per participating vendor organization?	See State response to question 12.
108		General	Is there a limit to the number of individuals who may participate in the Expo per application or per approved solution? If so, what is the maximum attendance limit?	See State response to question 44.
109	4	Section 2.1c. and 2.1.d.	Can the solution and/or technology for a track include multiple vendors as part of a full solution?	Yes. See State response to question 44.
110		General	With regards to what the state of TN is looking for, can the vendor focus on Health specific use cases, e.g., Eligibility & Enrollment for Medicaid or a Payer with AI, or refilling prescriptions, or even COVID related call center with AI development?	Yes.

3. **RFI Amendment Effective Date.** The revisions set forth herein shall be effective upon release. All other terms and conditions of this RFI not expressly amended herein shall remain in full force and effect.