State of Nevada
Department of Administration
Purchasing Division
515 E. Musser Street, Suite 300
Carson City, NV 89701

Brian Sandoval
Governor

Jeffrey Haag
Administrator

SUBJECT:	Amendment 1 to Request for Proposal 3212
RFP TITLE:	Workers' Compensation Regulatory Software System
DATE OF AMENDMENT:	November 4, 2015
DATE OF RFP RELEASE:	October 12, 2015
OPENING DATE:	November 18, 2015
OPENING TIME:	2:00 PM
CONTACT:	Ronda Miller, Procurement Staff Member

The following shall be a part of RFP ***3212.*** If a vendor has already returned a proposal and any of the information provided below changes that proposal, please submit the changes along with this amendment. You need not re-submit an entire proposal prior to the opening date and time.

---

1. I would like to know who responded to the RFI for the Replacement of the Manufactured Housing Division's Core Business Systems please.

   GL Solutions, Praeses, LLC, and State of Nevada, Department of Administration, Enterprise Information Technology Services Division.

2. The State has requested a large amount of detail in bidders' responses to this RFP. Given our desire to work through the State's problem to come up with a thoughtful and thorough response, we respectfully request a two-week extension for this proposal.

   No extensions are being granted.

3. Regarding Business Reference items 6.3.2.2, "Delivering worker compensation system solutions," and Implementation Lead Qualification item 6.4.3.2, if a vendor does not have experience specifically in worker compensation system solutions, but has extensive experience delivering systems that successfully "support business processes similar to WCS," will that vendor be disqualified or severely downgraded? Will the state remove or alter these specific requirements in order to allow for a more competitive bidding process including vendors highly qualified per other RFP requirements, and based on many successful implementations with state regulatory agencies in various industries?

   The specified criteria will not be altered. Vendor responses will be evaluated based upon the stated criteria. Vendors with successful implementations with state regulatory agencies in various industries will be scored in light of that experience but may not score as highly in that area as vendors with successful implementations specifically in worker compensation system solutions.

DIR is looking for a vendor that has expertise in workers compensation and can "hit the ground running". The expectation is that the vendor will provide valuable guidance on: improving operations; implementation of various industry standards; and approaches to interface to external stakeholders (e.g. insurers, TPAs, etc.). This expertise will be critical in Task 1 – BPR and Detailed Requirements.

Regarding the "Implementation Lead Qualifications" (6.4.3.2), vendors can have other members of their project team meet the workers compensation requirement if the designated Implementation Lead does not have this experience.

4. On page 18, item 3.4.4.2, please elaborate on "VERSA had limited capabilities for workers' compensation business processes." (a) Are there specific configuration and automation items which were not possible in the system? (b) Or are there specific configuration and automation items which were not provided during implementation based on RFP requirements – functionality which is has been called out in this RFP as required in this new solution?

   Although the prior RFP released in 2008 did call for recording, maintaining and tracking of data, it did not specifically call for a relational database that could generate reports based on queries and sufficient security to allow public stakeholders to electronically input mandated data reporting through an internet connection; which is what is currently required in this solution.

5. On page 21, item 4.4.1.1, what will be the vendor responsibility for IAIABC EDI standards versus the state responsibility for these standards, and how will adherence to these standards be measured and required throughout implementation?

   This is to be determined based upon the state selecting an EDI vendor for data clearing house purposes. Vendors should be knowledgeable about IAIABC EDI-standards.

6. On page 22, item 4.4.1.5, please define the manual data entry and then a measure for significant reduction.

   The inadequacies of the Versa system requires WCS staff to utilize multiple Excel spreadsheets and Access databases in addition to Versa for processing workflows. These Excel and Access files do not integrate with Versa and, as a result, data entry redundancies are significant in the current situation. The new system would focus on a relational database in which the data entry redundancies would be eliminated or greatly reduced.

7. On page 22, item 4.4.1.5, (a) To what extent can the State require external users to enter data online and not allow submission of paper forms? (b) If the State is not able to exclusively require online data entry, to what extent is the State prepared to push and drive external users to enter data online? (c) Are there specific tools and methods the State is expecting to be used to meet this requirement?

   (a) The State does not currently have explicit authority to require electronic submission of forms.

   (b) The State is prepared to make data submission by external users as easy and efficient as possible. This would include providing web-based electronic forms and uploading capabilities. The State would most likely allow alternative (paper) as well, at least for a

reasonable period of time to allow for transition to the electronic method(s) that will be made available.

(c) The State is expecting a web-based portal user interface to allow online data submission, document uploading and online fee payment capabilities. The State would strongly encourage external users to transition to and utilize these electronic methods, and any others agreed upon and developed by the contracted vendor.

8. Page 22, item 4.4.1.7 and page 30, 4.4.11.1 reference reports. Please provide the names of all system outputs required, including reports, queries, and correspondences. Also provide the audience and the location from which each will be run (back-office, public website, specific login-secured area of public website, etc.). If such details are not available at this time, please provide at least the number of reports to be produced or at least a range for scoping purposes.

A comprehensive list of reports, queries and correspondences is not available at this time. The type and number will be determined after the Business Process Re-Engineering (BPR) has been completed, and the new business processes are determined and documented. In general, ad-hoc querying and reporting will be very important to respond to the many inquiries we receive. The final system and all data captured will need to be highly searchable.

Examples of the types of reports that would be required are: Accounts Receivables/Aging Reports; Annual Report of Complaints, Fines, Benefit Penalties, Appeals and Final Disposition; and Performance Measures. Examples of the types of correspondence required are: Determination Letters; Notices of Fines; and Demand Letters. Examples of the types of queries are: Prior Claims History; Prior Violations History; and Case Status.

9. For page 22, item 4.4.1.20, please provide metrics for reasonable response-time/performance. Requirements such as 90% of the time X must open in X seconds.

WCS does not have a specific metrics for response-time/performance requirements. The expectation is the vendor will architect their system so that it performs at a level where it enables the user to operate in an efficient effective manner without undue delays in completing a task. Acceptable response times can vary depending on the type of activity occurring. For example:

- ***Data entry activities – This is where users are looking up records and keying in data. Response times should not be more than 1-2 seconds 95% of the time. Users should be able to key in data easily without the system lagging behind.***

- ***Navigating from one screen to another - Response times should not be more than 1-2 seconds 95% of the time.***

- ***Simple reports – This is where users run reports that involve very simple queries. The response time should range in the 1 – 10 seconds 95% of the time.***

- ***Complex reports – The requirements will vary.***

- ***Attaching an electronic document to a record in the system – From the point where the user has selected a document and click to attach it should the response time should range in the 1 – 5 seconds 95% of the time for a small document.***

10. For page 33, item 4.5.3, please describe an independent standard e.g. ISO or the criteria to which the security analysis must measure.

Below are several state security policies that will need to be considered by contractors in delivering a solution. State staff will work with staff to refine and document security measures.

Contractors:
http://it.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/ITnvgov/Content/Governance/dtls/Standards/119StandardInformationTechnologyContractors.pdf

System Development:
http://it.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/ITnvgov/Content/Governance/dtls/Standards/131SecurityforSoftwareDevelopment.pdf

System & Data Backup:
http://it.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/ITnvgov/Content/Governance/dtls/Standards/132DataSystemBackupRecovery.pdf

11. Please clarify who is being referred to as "Security staff" on page 34, Section 4.5.10.6.

We expect to have staff from the State of Nevada, Department of Administration, Office of Information Security participate in security reviews at different points in the project. In addition, the vendor must have staff experienced in designing and implementing security features and controls.

12. On page 35, Requirements Matrix, for vendors proposing a COTS system, our understanding is that configuration to meet a requirement qualifies as "S – Standard Function", as configuration does not fit into any of the other categories. Please confirm this understanding is correct, or please add a category for configuration.

That is correct. If a vendor's COTS solution meets a requirement, and it is included within the scope of the proposal (assuming it is a configuration rather than custom development) it should be included as "S- Standard Function".

13. On page 35, item 4.6.6, are we correct in understanding that if all requirements are included in the firm fixed price, a statement to that effect needs to be included in response to every requirement?

Vendors must acknowledge if the cost reflects each requirement.

14. On pages 36-37, items 5.2.1.1 - 5.2.3.1 might be understood that the vendor and the State will ship one master copy and five additional hard copies of some or all deliverables back and forth for review/rejection/acceptance. Please clarify and confirm that all deliverable reviews can be done via electronic copies, even in cases of written deliverables where the final will be provided via shipped hard copies.

All document type (e.g. PDF, word, spreadsheets, diagrams) deliverable reviews can be done via electronic copies, unless otherwise agreed to by both the state and the contractor. Documents need to be provided to the state in a standard readable form. Where appropriate

the vendor can also do demonstrations of systems, prototypes, etc., using collaboration tools such as WebEx.

15. On page 41, item 5.5 notes a preference "not to have a 'water-fall' project approach, but one where DIR staff is interactive with the vendor during each task." And page 44, item 5.8.2.2 seems to indicate the vendor will build, demonstrate, get feedback, and (re)design. If not understood the same by all vendors, this approach has the potential to greatly increase some vendors' proposed costs, and/or to greatly increase some vendors' expectation for State staff involvement. Please elaborate on the State's desired approach.

    The state wants to be involved throughout the entire process to ensure that the end product is appropriate for business operations with minimal or no human workarounds. Having a highly structured waterfall approach may lead to costly changes or make changes impossible thus affecting the work process.

    It is important that the vendor demonstrates the look and feel, workflow and behavior of the system throughout the project. This will allow WCS users to validate use-cases early in the project before the development/configuration is complete. If done properly, this should reduce rework over the course of the project.

16. On page 80, item 13.1.7, please further clarify the scoring criteria for the cost, requirements, and all areas of the response with specific points scales to help vendors understand how the State will objectively evaluate all vendor responses to determine which one is "in the best interests of the State of Nevada after all factors have been evaluated."

    This information is confidential.

17. On page 88, item 13.3.10, (a) Please clarify and quantify the State's expectation for exactly which, and how much, of the "design, development and testing activities will occur in Henderson, NV." (b) Or if the quantity of onsite activity is to be determined during contract negotiation or during project planning, please clarify how vendors should propose costs on a per-trip basis to accommodate this variable factor.

    The amount of design, development, and testing activities that will occur in Henderson, NV will be determined during the project planning phase. The vendor has the option of including travel costs within vendor overhead costs or showing such travel costs as a breakout item.

18. On page 88, item 13.3.11.1 notes that "the State will have a nonexclusive, royalty-free and irrevocable license to reproduce or otherwise use and authorize others to use all software…" As worded, this requirement seems to set up the State to be a direct competitor with the vendor, which would not be acceptable to most (any?) vendors who have a proven, valuable product. (a) Please remove, or further clarify this requirement. (b) Will this requirement be subject to negotiation? (c) In the case of a COTS product, can this be interpreted to mean that the product will be licensed only for the named users at the State, and that the website components for external users may be accessed and used by the public without limit to the number of users, specifically for the purposes described in this RFP?

    The State declines to remove this requirement; however, if vendors have an exception and/or an assumption that requires a change in the terms and conditions vendor must provide the specific language being proposed on Attachment B of the RFP.

19. In light of answers to vendor questions being provided on or around Monday, November 2nd, and RFP responses being due for delivery on Wednesday, November 18th both in electronic and printed versions, we are concerned with the time available to consume, adjust, produce and submit a quality response following the detailed instructions for proposal submission. Would the State consider extending the Proposal due date by two weeks?

At this time the opening date remains the same.

20. We have a Named User licensing structure. We define Named Users as "staff with access to the back-office Software regardless of whether such access is concurrent or consecutive." Based on this definition, how many Named Users does the Division anticipate having on its new system?

Approximately seventy (70) Named Users.

21. Your RFP mentions a need for certain third-party data-exchange interfaces. Please provide an inventory of these required system interfaces and the purpose of each. Also, please note if each interface will be one-way or two-way.

Data exchange interfaces will be determined by the Business Process Re-Engineering. Possible system interfaces include the following:

- ***National Council on Compensation Insurance (NCCI) – policy data (one way)***
- ***Nevada Division of Insurance (DOI) - Insurer & TPA licensing info, fines, investigations, etc. (two way)***
- ***Nevada Attorney General's Office (AG) – employer investigations (two way)***
- ***Nevada Department of Employment, Training & Rehabilitation (DETR) – claim payment info, employer info (two way)***
- ***Nevada Contractors Board (NSCB) – employer fines/penalties info (one way)***
- ***Nevada Controller's Office – fine/penalty payment, debt collection & referral (two way)***
- ***Nevada Secretary of State (SOS)/Silverflume – employer info (two way)***
- ***Third Party Vendor (TBD) - claims data/IAIABC FROI SROI (one way)***
- ***External Stakeholders – Insurers, Third Party Administrators, Attorneys, Claimants, Medical Providers, Employers, etc. – contact info, claims data, audit and complaint responses, fine and penalty payment – (two way)***

22. As a COTS software provider, we have a standard license agreement and additional contract terms which need to be incorporated into the procurement process. Where in our response should these appear?

Part I A ~ Technical Proposal Submission Requirements ~ Tab XII Other Information Material.

23. We offer multiple support plan options in addition to the primary support plan we will be proposing. How would you like us to incorporate the additional options and corresponding contract language into our proposal, to provide the agency with the right and option to choose from our full range of support options in the future?

Vendors must clearly identify additional/optional solutions within their submitted proposal.

24. The project management, deliverable submission/documentation/ assessment/reporting requirements, while achievable, may be excessive for the size and scope of this project, and

may greatly increase the cost of the project. These requirements will likely increase the cost of the project versus our standard and historically successful approaches to managing implementations and support. Is the stated project management approach necessary and required, or is there flexibility on the project management and external monitoring/assessment/reporting requirements in order to reduce costs?

It is assumed you are referring to Section 5.2 Deliverable Submission and Review Process. WCS desires that the process is efficient and effective and is open to vendor presenting their approach. Vendors should present their approach preparing and submitting deliverables and reporting.

25. Please fully define and quantify the ongoing support the agency will require after system implementation, including inclusion or exclusion of each item (and sub-item) in the following categories:

The Department of Business & Industry has a very small IT staff. WCS has a new IT position that will be dedicated primarily to support the new WCS system. The Department of Administration, Enterprise Technology Section has DBAs on staff that can provide limited assistance for support. The type of support will likely vary depending if the solution is a COTS or custom, and cloud or state hosted.

(a) Help Desk Support (24x7 emergency support, end-user support, configuration and troubleshooting, developer-to-developer support, hardware/network/security tips, architecture and best practice guidance, online remote desktop support, dedicated account management, local user group support)

Two years help desk support for end-user support, troubleshooting system issues, developer and DBA support as needed to resolve software issues. WCS would like the option to continue with support in the following years.

(b) Training and Documentation (web courses, agency-specific process training, software training, core software documentation, user conference)

Training will be required with the initial deployment for users to be proficient with the system upon go-live. Support should be available for at least three months following go-live.

(c) Software Patches and Releases (new major version software release versions, installation of new software versions, core software patches, installation of core software patches)

The vendor should provide assistance and needed during the first year after go-live.

(d) Customization, Enhancement, and Corrections (design/configuration/testing support, customization projects, customization tasks, defect correction, installation of customization corrections)

The vendor should provide assistance and needed during the first year after go-live.

(e) Hosting Service (weekly backup, daily backup, hosting of proposed proprietary software solution, IP address owned and provided by Company, maintenance of hosting environment, data security)

This will depend on the proposed solution. If the vendor host the system (cloud) then the vendor will be responsible for all of the above, including hosting, backup and recovery, security, patch and upgrade management. If the state host the system, then the state will be responsible for these items.

26. Can you elaborate on the agency's preferences regarding hosting with the vendor?

WCS is open to either a vendor or state hosted solution. WCS will evaluate based on the costs and benefits of each.

27. What were the implementation costs and total annual support costs for the systems previously implemented which are being replaced by this procurement?

The original implementation of the Versa System included two Sections, WCS and Mechanical. The two sections were hosted on the same servers (state owned), in the same software/database instance, however they operate as two separate entities. The implementation costs were approximately $700,000 for both sections. The WCS portion was approximately $350,000. The annual maintenance (excluding enhancements and DBA support) is approximately $43,000/year.

The Claims Indexing System was developed by the Department of Information Technology (now EITS) approximately 15+ years ago. No cost information is available. Within the last year EITS upgraded the system to current versions of Oracle and Microsoft .NET.

28. What is the budget for this project?

    a. If all cost proposals come in above a certain amount, would this RFP be cancelled?

WCS will assess the best approach. This may include modifying the project scope or approach.

    b. What is that amount?

Year 1 (FY2016): $2,000,000
Year 2 (FY2017):$500,000
Ongoing maintenance costs are estimated to be $30,000 – 50,000

    c. Did the legislature allocate any funds specifically for this project? If so, what is the amount allocated, and when does it need to be used?

See b. above. The funds need to be used by June 30, 2017.

29. Please identify instances where any agency employee has viewed or discussed a potential software application similar to the one being solicited in this RFP in the last 24 months. Please name the vendor(s), dates of contact and describe the nature of the contacts including whether pricing was discussed. Has the agency received any estimates or quotations for the services and software describe in this RFP, and if so, which ones and what were the amounts?

The following vendors provided demonstrations to the State:

GL Solutions – March 24, 2015

CapTech Consulting - May 11, 2015
HCL America – June 11, 2015
Xerox Sevices – September 17, 2015

Pricing estimates and quotes were not discussed.

30. ADMINISTRATIVE/GENERAL QUESTIONS: 1. RFP 5.2–5.3: Please confirm that bidders do not need to respond to RFP 5.2 or RFP 5.3.

This information should be taken into consideration when preparing vendor response.

31. RFP 6.1.11.1–3: Please clarify if bidders should include responses to these three questions (D&B number, Tax ID, and financial statements) in response to Part IA: Technical or only in Part III: Confidential Financial Information?

Part III Confidential Financial Information.

32. RFP 6.1.3 states that "The selected vendor, prior to doing business in the State of Nevada, must be appropriately licensed by the State of Nevada, Secretary of State's Office pursuant to NRS76." Does the State require bidders to be licensed prior to proposal submission, or simply prior to beginning the contract work?

Prior to final approval of contract.

33. RFP 6.2.1.5 ("Business references…must be provided by subcontractors"): please clarify if proposed subcontractors must provide five references each OR if proposed subcontractor references are included within the five total references provided in the proposal. In other words, if we have one subcontractor—is it five prime contractor references PLUS five subcontractor references for a total of ten; OR is it five total references (some from the prime contractor and some from the subcontractor)?

Vendors should provide a minimum of five (5) business references from similar projects performed for private, state and/or large local government clients within the last five (5) years.

34. RFP 6.4 ("Vendor Staff Skills and Experience Required): please clarify if bidders must explicitly respond to this section in Part IA/Tab VIII ("Company Background…"), or if this will be evaluated through appropriate and qualified resumes supplied in Part IA/Tab IX ("Resumes").

Part I A~ Technical Proposal Submission.

35. RFP 11.1.5 (format of the response): we are concerned that it would be visually difficult for the evaluators to read an entire proposal comprised of bold/italic text and want to confirm this requirement. May bidders respond in another way, as long as the responses are clearly differentiated from the RFP questions?

When responding to the section of the RFP written responses must be in bold/italics and placed immediately following the RFP question, statement and/or section. Exceptions/assumptions to this may be considered during the evaluation process.

36. RFP 11.1.5 (format of the response): if responses must be in bold/italic, please clarify if graphics/tables/charts must also be in bold/italics.

No.

37. RFP 11.1.5 (format of the response): please verify that bidders are to use our own proposal templates (i.e., pages formatted with our own headers/footers), and that are we should copy/paste the RFP headings/text verbatim into our proposals immediately preceding our response to each question. Given the instructions for each Tab in RFP Section 11, we assume that we are NOT supposed to simply respond directly within the RFP word document. NOTE: allowing bidders to use our own proposal templates will allow us to include necessary graphics, charts, and sub-headings that will ease with readability of the responses.

Refer to Section 11 Proposal Submission Requirements of the RFP.

38. RFP 11.2.2 ("the technical proposal must not include confidential technical information): How would the state prefer bidders handle confidential information in Part IA? Should we simply delete it and make a statement referring evaluators to Part IB, should we include it by "black" it out (redact it), or handle it in some other way?

Refer to Section 11 Proposal Submission Requirements of the RFP.

39. RFP 11.2.3 ("Part IA Format and Content"): is it acceptable to include a brief (2-page) Executive Summary that briefly summarizes our proposal? If so, under which tab should this be included?

Refer to Section 11 Proposal Submission Requirements of the RFP.

40. RFP 11.2.3.4.D (Vendor Licensing Agreements): please confirm that this is required only if the proposed solution is "Commercial Off The Shelf," and not applicable to custom-builds.

Refer to Section 11 Proposal Submission Requirements of the RFP.

41. RFP 11.2.3.6 (Tab VI) and RFP 11.2.3.11 (Tab X): both tabs asked for bidders to complete Attachment L (Requirements Matrix). Should bidders include this in both places? Please clarify.

Refer to Section 14 Submission Checklist of the RFP.

42. RFP 11.2.3.7 and RFP 11.2.3.9: both sections ask for a Preliminary Project Plan (RFP 11.2.3.7 asks for responses to Section 5, "Vendors must reflect within their proposal and preliminary project plan"; and RFP 11.2.3.9 asks for responses to Section 6.6, "Vendors must submit a preliminary project plan as part of the proposal…"). Please clarify where the Preliminary Project Plan should be included within the proposal.

Refer to Section 14 Submission Checklist of the RFP.

43. RFP 11.2.3.8 (Tab VII) seems to include responses to Section 6.1–6.4; RFP 11.2.3.9 (Tab IX) seems to include responses to Section 6.5; and RFP 11.2.3.10 (Tab X) seems to include responses to Section 6.6. Please clarify in which tab bidders should include responses to Section 6.7–6.13.

Refer to Section 14 Submission Checklist of the RFP.

44. RFP 13.1 states that "information in this section does not need to be returned with the vendor's proposal." However, Section 13.1.9 states that "Proposals must include any and all proposed terms and conditions, including without limitation, written warranties, maintenance/service agreements…etc." Two questions:

    a. Please clarify where (which Part and Tab) this information should be included.

    b. If we propose a 100% custom-built solution, is this still required? We assume that this is only required for Commercial Off the Shelf (COTS) solutions.

Refer to Section 14 Submission Checklist of the RFP.

45. RFP 13.3.12.6 states that "Any costs associated with an escrow account must be included in Attachment J, Project Costs." However, RFP 13.3.12.2 does not state whether or not an escrow account is required (it simply says, "if required"). Please clarify if an escrow account is required as part of this project.

This will be determined during negotiations.

46. RFP 13.3.19 provides guidance on key personnel, but does not state who (which roles) are considered key. Please clarify which positions are considered key.

Project Manager, workers compensation subject matter expert, and lead technical staff.

47. Attachment G (Project Deliverable Sign-off Form): please confirm that this form is for informational purposes and is NOT required as part of the proposal submission.

Yes.

48. Attachment J (Project Costs) instructions state, "Detailed backup must be provided for all cost schedules completed." Beyond what is required within Attachment J and Attachment L, what else is required as backup?

That is it.

49. Attachment L (Requirements Matrix): many of the requirements in this spreadsheet are the same as those found in Section 4. Rather than repeating responses, may we reference back to where we have already addressed requirements within Tab VI of Part IA?

Vendors must submit all required forms and attachments. Vendors may take exceptions using Attachment B of the RFP.

50. SCOPE OF WORK & TECHNICAL QUESTIONS: RFP 5.15 ("Task 10 – Warranty and Corrective Maintenance): please clarify the minimum warranty period required for this work.

COTS software – Software defects will be corrected for the entire period WCS is maintaining a maintenance contract with the vendor.

Custom software – Software defects will be corrected for at least one year after go-live.

51. Is Nevada evaluating any specific vendors to provide reporting/data visualization capabilities? If so, can Nevada please share the names of these vendors?

No such vendors being evaluated at this time.

52. Attachment L (Requirements Matrix), #5.5: please describe, in further detail, any additional requirements around OCR.

There are no specific requirements defined at this time as to how OCR might be used. During Task1 – BPR and Detailed Requirements, the vendor, working with WCS will determine if and how OCR should be used. It is possible that OCR is not appropriate.

53. Ref 4.4.1.7: How many standard reports are there?

Refer to question 8 of this Amendment.

54. Ref 4.4.1.17: How many workflows are there, and how complex are they?

Workflows are generally described in Attachment L – Requirements Matrix. The number and specific nature of the workflows will be determined by the Business Process Re-Engineering phase of the project.

55. Ref 4.4.1.18: Is an alert an in-application notification or an email, or both?

Both. It depends on the work flow process and timelines, which will determine whether an in-application notification or e-mail notification is necessary.

56. Which lookup values are in scope for Case Management (4.4.2.2) versus the lookup values in 4.4.1.15?

These would be the same. For example, the trained system administrator should be able to query, "How many <u>complaints</u> did we receive for Insurance Company ABC during 2014?" or, change the value of an initial <u>fine</u> being $375 to $500, or, "how many <u>audits</u> were performed in 2015?" Or, any combination of the above in a relational database.

57. Ref 4.4.2.8: What parts of the data can have access limited?

Data that identifies licensing and discipline regarding licensed medical providers.

58. Does the registration/regulation of PEO (4.4.3.8) mean PEOs can register themselves online, or is this WCS internal?

Section 4.4.3.8 does not refer to PEO requirements. However, the PEO registration process could be a hybrid model where some processes are done through system access by the PEO while others are required to be done manually. This is because the registration process requires that some documents are originals rather than copies. In addition, some registrations require documents to be provided to other agencies for approval. The ability to issue the certifications within the system is preferred as well as notifications to the PEO and the investigator of an approaching expiration/renewal.

59. What is the legislative approved budget on this procurement?

Refer to question 28 of this Amendment.

60. Is client interested in the newer version on VERSA application/solution?

The state is not interested in a newer version of VERSA.

61. Is the client interested in custom/tailored solution or only off-the-self solution?

The state has not pre-determined the type of solution. If an off-the-self solution meets the needs of the state it will most certainly be evaluated as a potential solution as will a custom/tailored solution.

62. Can workers themselves file claims and get the data added to the claim Indexing system

No, a worker cannot file a claim and get data added to the Claims Indexing System. The DIR does not have a system for injured workers to file claims directly with the state due to the fact that all claims must be filed directly with the Employer's insurance carrier or third party administrator (TPA). The carrier or TPA is responsible for claims index reporting.

63. The data that goes into claims Indexing system is received in document form. How many variations/formats of such documents are used? If the format is revised, is the revision backward compatible?

There is a hard copy form and an electronic file layout. The data elements are prescribed by statute and therefore do not/have not changed since its inception.

64. What data gets entered into the versa system? Is it the same information that is in the claims indexing system?

The Versa system and the Claims Indexing System operate independently and do not, generally speaking, contain the same information. The Claims Indexing System contains claims data supplied by workers' compensation insurers and Third Party Administrators (TPAs). The Versa system contains internal business function information such as case management, investigation and audit tracking, compliance records such as fines and penalties, contact and license information for regulated entities and such as Insurers, Third Party Administrators, Professional Employee Organizations (PEOs), Rating Physicians, etc.

65. Are the claims indexing system and VERSA dependent on each other in any way? Ex: share data, users, databases,

Refer to question 64 of this Amendment. Internal users of the Claims Indexing System are also users of the Versa system, but the systems are not dependent upon each other.

66. Is there one or more business processes in WCS that require a WCS staff member use both the systems (CIS and VERSA) to get the outcome of the business process? Can you provide an example.

Not at this time. The Claims Indexing System (CIS) is not part of any internal business process. Its current purpose is for providing external stakeholders (i.e. Insurers and Third Party Administrators) prior claims history.

67. What is the date that WCS anticipates responding to vendor RFP questions?

Anticipated on or around November 4, 2015.

68. Beyond what is outlined in the RFP as required response elements, is there a prescriptive response format for RFP responses?

Refer to Section 11 of the RFP.

69. How is WCS planning on evaluating RFP responses? What is the evaluation criteria and scoring?

This information is confidential.

70. Did WCS use a vendor to help develop the RFP? If so, can WCS please share the name of the vendor?

The RFP was developed in-house by the state.

71. Did WCS evaluate solutions that could meet its requirements through vendor demonstrations leading up to the RFP release? If so, what types and names of solutions and vendors were evaluated?

Refer to question 29 of this Amendment.

72. What is WCS's budget for one-time implementation cost? What is WCS's budget for recurring software license and support cost?

Refer to question 28 of this Amendment.

73. What are the anticipated number of WCS internal named users that will require access to the solution?

Approximately seventy (70) Named Users.

74. Can WCS please define each of the user types/roles?

To be determined. This would be defined after the business process and analysis is completed.

75. What are the anticipated number of external users (i.e., small business owners, providers, etc.) that will require access to the solution?

At the time of this Amendment there were:

3,604 treating physicians
190 rating physicians

400 licensed insurance companies
400 self-insured employers
8 associations of self-insured employers
150 professional employer organizations (PEO)
<u>40 licensed third party administrators</u>

4,352* external users

****In addition to an unknown number of general public users who will have very limited viewing-only capabilities, as opposed to the above-stated, who will have full viewing and submitting capability.***

76. Does WCS anticipate any data migration from a legacy system to the new system? If so, how many records?

Yes, we anticipate data migration from the Versa system and the Claims Indexing System, as well as other spreadsheets and databases currently maintained by WCS. The number is TBD and is dependent upon the processes and workflows that will be determined by the Business Process Re- Engineering. Records included in the final data migration could number from the tens of thousands to the hundreds of thousands.

77. Does WCS require any integration to third party systems? If so, please list them.

There are no existing 3rd party systems that require integration.

78. Does WCS require a need for any Change Management services for this solution?

Since WCS is looking to improve business processes, using enabling technology, the vendor should provide guidance in making the transition.

79. What is the implementation timeline? When does this system need to be live?

Ideally before June 30, 2017.

80. The RFP states, "Outreach Program Contacts (includes written, electronic & telephone inquiries, education outreach contacts and website hits) in FY14: 618,270." Please provide the breakdown between each type of contact. How many were website hits versus all other types of communication?

Written Inquiries:	***566***
Other Inquiries (Email, Telephone, Walk-Ins, Coverage Inquiries):	***90,918***
Individual Contacts (Presentations/Trainings, Newsletter Distribution, etc.):	***27,812***
Website Hits:	***<u>498,974</u>***
	618,270

ALL ELSE REMAINS THE SAME FOR RFP 3212.

Vendor must sign and return this amendment with proposal submitted.

Vendor Name: _____

Authorized Signature: _____

Title: _____ Date: _____

This document must be submitted in the "State Documents" section/tab of vendors' technical proposal.