



MANATEE COUNTY FLORIDA

email

May 16, 2013

TO: All Interested Proposers

SUBJECT: Request for Proposal (RFP) #13-1529DC
(Vendor-Host) Claims Management Software System

ADDENDUM #1

Proposers are hereby notified that this Addendum shall be made a part of the above named solicitation document. The following items are issued to add to, modify, and clarify the proposed requirements. Proposals to be submitted on the specified bid date, shall conform to the additions and revisions listed herein.

1. Time and Date Due is changed to: **May 31, 2013 at 3:00 P.M.**, same location.
2. Clarification for RFP item C.01: Proposers expertise of insurance claims processing functions is preferable, but is not a requirement for responding to this proposal. Proposer shall provide their knowledge and expertise as requested in item C.03.
3. Omission of RFP item C.03 is a numbering error. There is no information to be submitted for this item number.
4. Manatee County, as referenced in this RFP, is requesting a web-base system approach and has no interest in a managed technology service provider.
5. Delete RFP page 22 and insert attached Revised 22, addenda acknowledgment included.
6. Attached are the responses to the questions received.

Proposals will be received at Manatee County Purchasing, 1112 Manatee Avenue West, Suite 803, Bradenton, Florida 34205 until **May 31, 2013 at 3:00 P.M.** If you have submitted a proposal prior to receiving this Addendum, you may request in writing that your sealed proposal be returned to your firm.

Sincerely,

Deborah Carey-Reed, CPPB
Contract Negotiator

Attachments

Financial Management Department - Purchasing Division
1112 Manatee Avenue West, Suite 803, Bradenton, FL 34205
PHONE: 941.749.3074 * FAX: 941.749.3034
www.mymanatee.org

ATTACHMENT A: PROPOSAL SIGNATURE FORM

For: RFP #13-1529DC CLAIMS MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE SYSTEM

Firm Name: _____

Mailing Address: _____

City, State, Zip Code

FL Dept of Business Regulation License #: _____ if applicable

Federal Employer Identification Number (FEIN): _____

MBE/WBE/SBE Certification? _____

Telephone No: (____) _____

Email address: _____

The undersigned attests to his (her, their) authority to submit this proposal and to bind the firm herein named to perform as per agreement. If the firm is selected by the County the undersigned certifies that he/she will negotiate in good faith to establish an agreement to provide consulting services according to the requirements of this Request for Proposal.

Date: _____

Signature

Name and Title of Above Signer

Address of branch office proposed to service Manatee County if other than above

Name and Title of Firm's Representative for Manatee County

Telephone Number and Email Address of Firm's Representative for Manatee County

Addendum# _____ Dated _____

Addendum# _____ Dated _____

Responses provided by Manatee County Risk Manager, Ray Carter:

05/07/2013 11:08 AM Questions

B.02 Project Overview: Please clarify the workflow around the entry of new incidents. Can any County employee or vendor enter and incident?

Initially, upon start up and going live, all incidents will be reported to Risk Management via fax or email. There are no plans to have 'vendors' entering incidents. It is anticipated, that upon successful implementation of the system, within one year, access would be given to select 'high frequency' departments for incident entry into the RMIS system.

B.02 Project Overview: Are WC incidents reviewed by risk management prior to being sent to the TPA?

It is expected that all incidents will be input and reviewed by Risk Management. Again, when the 'field' is given access to input incidents into the system it will be sent directly to Risk Management for review and editing. When an incident is upgraded to a claim it will be sent to the TPA.

B.02 Project Overview: Who is the County's WC TPA?

The County's WC TPA is Commercial Risk Management (CRM)

B.03.2 Requirements: There seems to be a discrepancy between a. and b.

- A. references uploading the last 3 years of claims from the current system
- B. references conversion of **all** data from existing systems to the new System

The County requires uploading of the last three complete fiscal years, plus the current year. A fiscal year is October 1 through September 30.

B.03.2 Requirements:

- C. References real time file access. Does this apply to the WC files being handled by the TPA?

The real time access relates to the RMIS system, specifically within the County's Risk Management system, and does not relate to real time transfer of data between the RMIS and a TPA's system.

B.03.2 Requirements:

D. How many users outside of risk management would need access to generate their own reports?

It is not anticipated that users outside of Risk Management would be generating their own reports. However, if the vendors system permits or has that ability the County may consider providing it.

B.03.2 Requirements:

- E. 1. How many other systems need to be integrated with the claim system?

It is anticipated that "financials" from the TPA would be "updated" on a reoccurring basis into the RMIS claim files. The county desires that the RMIS system pull employee data from our payroll system, when incidents are created or upgraded to claims, for efficiencies. Vehicle data bases will be provided by the County biannually, in excel, for the vendors upload into the RMIS system

2. What is the desired frequency of updates?

The County is unsure what is being asked for in the 'desired frequency of updates'?

3. Is data being pulled into the claim system or pushed out to the other county systems or both?

There are currently no plans for the RMIS system to push data to other county systems. It is desirous for the RMIS system to systematically send standard, or customized subsets, of reports to predetermined users based on the internal hierarchy of the RMIS system on a monthly basis by coverage line.

F. What is the access requirement for County contracted vendors?

There are no plans for County contracted vendors to access the RMIS system per se. The only exception would be for the County's TPA(s), should it be necessary if business operations warrant it.

05/08/2013 1:29 PM Questions

Interface with 3rd party vendors:

1. Can you please identify who these 3rd party vendors are and desired frequency of interface?

The only current interface would be with the County's WC TPA Commercial Risk Management (CRM), and should be at a minimum, an update of the claim financials into the RMIS system. Obviously, should the County change TPA's or add a TPA for GL and Auto we would need to establish an interface for at a minimum financials.

2. B03.2 - #E – references integration with the County's other relevant systems – can you please identify what they are and desired frequency of integration.

Addressed above; this would be the importing of relevant employee data from our Payroll system for WC claims.

3. B.03.1 - Who is the TPA on the WC claims? Do they login to you current system when adjusting WC claims or is there a feed from their system involved?

The WC TPA is Commercial Risk Management (CRM), they have provided us a login to their system.

B03.5 – Warranty Period of (1) one year:

1. Can you please further clarify the expectation of support during this one-year time period? Would the County's expectation be that service provided during this period would be billed as incurred?

It is the County's intention that the awarded vendor provides adequate support this first year to implement RMIS system. We understand, or believe, it may be necessary for the awarded vendor to have increased resources in the first year due to implementation, and be billed as incurred if practical, then have a set monthly fee and/or as incurred fee thereafter.

2. Can you please further define "system acceptance" which triggers the start of the warranty period. What would occur if system acceptance were delayed significantly due to the County unable to provide one of the deliverables which precipitates system acceptance?

System acceptance would be shortly after the RMIS system is live, the actual acceptance date, and specific details, would be negotiated in the contract to the awarded vendor.

Cost Proposal Questions:

1. Within the documentation there does not appear to be a preferred cost proposal format. Is there any preference to the number of years we project costs or the format?

The County desires to have a three year agreement with two one year renewals, and to have costs billed on a monthly basis through the duration of the agreement.

2. Does the County require CMS-111 (Medicare/Medicaid) services?

The County uses another vendor for this service. However, if the RMIS vendor can provide this option, and it is advantageous for the County, it may be considered.

Historical Claim Volume:

1. The RFP provided us with the expected annual volume of claims. Can you please share the historical claim/incident volume which would need to be migrated to the successful vendor.

The last three years of claims, including incidents, data capture only claims are as follows:

Year	Workers Compensation	Auto & General Liability	TOTALS
FY12	224	1288	1512
FY11	201	1357	1558
FY10	269	1593	1862

Users:

1. Page 10 – B.03.1 mentions “other users to be provided access to view claims, attachments, and reports...” – How many of these users does the County desire?

The system should be able to provide access to 10 additional users, besides the 5 Risk Management daily users, for read only applications. Perhaps, if possible, the ability to drill into reports/graphs/ or charts, to then be prompted to login, to review supporting claim data. These additional users will not have permissions to enter or alter the database and will be given read only access. It should be noted that the County is desirous of having incidents input by field staff/or liaison for ‘high frequency’ departments in time, as the RMIS system grows.

2. Page 10 - #G states “Accessibility by County contracted vendors” – Can you please elaborate on this accessibility by vendors (how many, what they would need to do in the system)

Addressed above

05/09/2013 3:12 PM Questions:

1. Can you provide greater detail regarding the interfaces that the county will require with the third party vendors and systems referenced in Section B.02 (for example: TPA)? Specifically, the total number and types of systems. Also, could you specify if these interfaces require a one-way or two-way exchange of data?

The third party vendor is a reference to our WC TPA Commercial Risk Management (CRM), and is intended for uploading ‘financials’ from their system to our RMIS. Should initiatives and/or

protocols be identified to enhance this communication, the County would encourage proposers identify these enhancements in their initial proposal.

2. Would the five employees in RMD require concurrent access to the proposed solution?

Yes, assuming you mean that there would be up to 5 RM associates in the system at any one time.

3. Can you provide greater detail regarding the integration that the county will require with the proposed claims management solution? Specifically, the total number and types of systems (for example: Accounting, HR)?

The system integration would include integration with Payroll for employee data, and possibly "lotus notes" for delivering monthly burst type of claim reports for Department/Divisional heads.

4. For conversion purposes from the current system, can you clarify the differences in "Provide cost to include uploading the last three fiscal years of claims from current systems" and "Provide a cost for conversion of all data from the existing systems to the new System"? Also, can you provide an estimate of the total number of claims to be converted and a total number of associated images to be converted?

Basically, the County is requesting that if there is any additional cost to upload the last three fiscal years of data, plus the current year, into the awarded vendors system, that this increased cost be shown in the first year of the contract. All subsequent year fees will be assessed monthly based on a negotiated amount.

Questions 05/13/2013 2:49 PM:

1. Describe the data needed to be converted in size, format and number of documents.

The County is desirous of importing claims data for the last three fiscal years, plus the current year into the system. The actual number and size of documents is unknown, but as shown above we average approximately 1,600 incidents/claims per year.

2. Expound on 'casual users' and their intended rights (you mention you have 5 full time users and others who will use the system).

The casual users may be those in the field, who eventually, may be given access to enter incidents directly into the system for review, and action, by the Risk Management Division. Should the ability present itself, if reports were provided to upper management, they could (after login) drill into the report for additional information. However, this would only be a 'read' only application.

3. Will we need to interface with the current document management system or do you require information on a replacement solution?

The interface would be with our WC TPA Commercial Risk Management (CRM) and be two-fold:

- a) Import previous claim data as previously described from both the WC TPA, and from our in-house system for GL & AL claims
- b) Interface with the RMIS system, to at a minimum, regularly update our financial claim data

The other application/interface if possible, would be with our Payroll System IFAS to import employee data, for efficient incident creation by having a employee 'look up' and pre-fill situation.

4. Who are the third parties you need us to interface with?

Addressed above