



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 17, 2015

Mr. Craig Purifoy  
Open Records Coordinator  
DFPS Records Management Group  
Texas Department of Family and Protective Services  
P.O. Box 149030  
Austin, Texas 78714-9030

OR2015-14607

Dear Mr. Purifoy:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 572083 (DFPS ORR ID# 05062015DPD).

The Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (the "department") received two requests for information regarding a specified request for proposals, namely, all submitted proposals, all best and final offer submissions, and all evaluative and scoring documents. You state the department will release some responsive information to the requestors. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Accenture P.L.C. ("Accenture"); Deloitte Consulting L.L.P. ("Deloitte"); Cognizant Technology Solutions; International Business Machines Corporation; Neos Consulting Group, L.L.C.; and Sense Corp. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their rights to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Accenture and Deloitte. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have only received comments from Accenture and Deloitte explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the other third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest the other third parties may have in it.

Accenture and Deloitte assert portions of their information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects (1) trade secrets and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b). Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a trade secret to be:

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business . . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. . . . It may . . . relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the

Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.<sup>1</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). We note pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because it is "simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business," rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

Section 552.110(b) protects "[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]" Gov't Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

Upon review, we find Accenture and Deloitte have established their customer information constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). Accordingly, to the extent the companies' customer information is not publicly available on their websites, the department must withhold Accenture's and Deloitte's customer information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, we find Accenture and Deloitte have failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find Accenture and Deloitte have failed to demonstrate the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for any of the remaining information. *See* ORDs 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade

---

<sup>1</sup>The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

secret claim), 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Consequently, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review, we find Deloitte has demonstrated its pricing information consists of commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the department must withhold Deloitte's pricing information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Although Accenture also seeks to withhold its pricing information, Accenture was the winning bidder with respect to the contract at issue. We note the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors); *see also* ORD 319 at 3. *See generally* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-45 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Further, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). Furthermore, we find Accenture and Deloitte have failed to demonstrate the release of the remaining information would result in substantial harm to their competitive positions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative). Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*: *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, to the extent Accenture's and Deloitte's customer information is not publicly available on the companies' websites, the department must withhold their customer information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The department must withhold Deloitte's pricing information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b)

of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Brian E. Berger  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BB/bhf

Ref: ID# 572083

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kevin Bell  
Deloitte Consulting  
400 West 15<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1700  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Sougata Das  
Cognizant Technology Solutions  
Glenpointe Centre West  
500 Frant West Burr Boulevard  
Teaneck, New Jersey 07666  
(w/o enclosures)

Accenture  
c/o Mr. Peter Eyre  
Crowell Moring  
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, North West  
Washington, DC 20004-2595  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Karon Irby  
Neos Consulting Group  
504 Lavaca Street, Suite 1005  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Adam Crafton  
IBM  
1 New Orchard Road  
Armonk, New York 10504-1722  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jimmy Schatte  
Sense Corporation  
Barton Oaks Plaza One, Suite 300  
901 South Mopac Expressway  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(w/o enclosures)