

ADDENDUM NO. 10

RFP Title: Request for Proposals for the Claims Processing Modernization Project

PIN: 01525BIST72560

Date: June 27, 2025

Contact: Alison MacLeod

Email: opportunity@comptroller.nyc.gov

THE ADDENDUM IS ISSUED FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) AND IS HEREBY MADE A PART OF SAID REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS TO THE SAME EXTENT AS THOUGH IT WERE ORIGINALLY THEREIN.

THE ADDENDUM ALSO INCLUDES ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE SOLICITATION. UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED BELOW, ALL TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THIS RFP REMAIN THE SAME. PROPOSERS MUST ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF ALL ADDENDA ISSUED AS INDICATED IN THIS RFP.

This addendum includes the following information:

1. COMPTROLLER’S OFFICE RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS:

The following is a list of questions submitted via email to opportunity@comptroller.nyc.gov:

	Question	Response
1	Section I, D Proposal Submission Deadline: With final vendor questions due on May 6, will the City please consider extending the proposal submission due date by a minimum of two weeks to allow time for the City to respond to final questions and for respondents to address any final questions submitted and potential modifications issued?	Please refer to Addendum 9.

2	Section II, B: Table 1, Table 2, Table 4 and Table 4 are missing from the published PDF. Will the City please provide the information from the missing tables to allow us to scope our proposal response?	Please refer to Addendum 2.
3	Section II, C Project Overview and Goals: Does the evaluation process include specific risks for each document type? If so, could the City please provide a detailed list of the identified risks to support our proposal preparation?	No
4	Section III, B Estimated Number of Users: Could the City please provide data on how many of the 40,000 external users interact with the web portal on a monthly basis?	The Portal is not part of the current system and thus, we do not have data on the number of external users who would access the portal on a monthly basis.
5	Section III, B, i Common Functional Requirements Overview, 5i. Intake and File: In reference to the functionalities outlined (specifically, the guided intake process for claim submission), could the City please provide sample claim forms for each claim type?	Please refer to Addendum 1 question 46.
6	Section III, B, 5.i.e Intake and File: Could the City please confirm whether there is an existing provider for initiating text notifications designated for use with the new system or whether the proposer should include a recommendation?	This functionality currently does not exist, hence there is no existing provider for text notifications
7	Section III, B, 5.i.e Intake and File: Could the City please specify which email provider (e.g., Microsoft Exchange, Gmail) is currently utilized for processing email communications and notifications for BLA?	Microsoft

8	Section III, B, 5.i.e Intake and File: Could the City please specify which solution is used to send text messages for processing text communications and notifications? If one is not currently used, does the City have a preference or should the vendor recommend a solution for this feature?	Text functionality is currently not used. Vendors are expected to propose a solution.
9	Section III, B, 5.i.i Intake and File: Could the City please clarify whether the City will provide the translated content for each of the 10 city official languages or should the vendor provide translation services for web content?	Please refer to Addendum 1 question 49.
10	Section III, B, 5.ii.b Assign and Manage: Could the City please confirm whether they have an application that currently captures scanned documents as OCR PDFs, or if the vendor is expected to recommend and provide appropriate software solutions for this functionality?	Please refer to Addendum 1 question 26 and Addendum 6 question 174.
11	Section III, B, 5.ii.b Assign and Manage: Could the City please clarify the intended workflow for handling PDF documents? Specifically, is the expectation that the system will automatically split PDF files into multiple documents, tag each as a required document type, and then associate these documents with a claim document checklist OR the user is able to manually split PDFs, tag and attach to a claim or checklist item?	Please refer to Exhibit B Functional Requirements: Claim Journey Maps of the RFP.

12	Section III, B, 5.iii.b Investigate and Evaluate: Based on the systems diagram, it appears that there are 10 system integrations available via cloud-based APIs. However, in Exhibit D not all integrations appear to be listed. Could you provide the Exhibit D details for the following integrations: DOF and Agency Contract DBs? Also, please specify how many and the details for each Agency Contract DBs.	Any information not included in Exhibit D would be provided to the selected contractor.
13	Section III, B, 5.iii.j Investigate and Evaluate: Based on the requirement for templated communications that prepopulate based on claim details, could the City please specify the number of template letters and template emails that need to be configured?	It is estimated that there will be 50 - 100 template letters and emails that need to be configured.
14	Section III, B, 5.v.a.iii Settlement Authorization/Pay a Claim Settlement: Could the City please specify which software is used for the Fiscal Management System (FMS)?	Integration with FMS is via SFTP. Please refer to Exhibit D
15	Section III, B, 6. Figure 1: Claims processing solution conceptual architecture diagram: Based on the system diagram indicating the availability of DocuSign, could the City please confirm whether the vendor should assume its use for the electronic signature component of the settlement process?	Yes
16	Section III, B, 7. Replace Existing Applications: The common functional requirements overview does not reference invoices. Could the City please clarify how invoices from BIST 50H Invoice Portal are intended to integrate	Ideally, the system will allow for issuance of invoices to the 50-h law firm vendors for the hearings the firms are taking on behalf of the City. If that is not possible, it will be important for there to be integration between the current 50h portal and the new system.

	into the overall workflow of the claims processing system?	
17	Section III, B, 9. Data Migration: Could the City please confirm whether data and documents from all five existing systems (OASIS, Public eClaim Portal, DOE eClaim Portal, BIST 50H Invoice Portal, Judgment and Claims Settlement Payment Inquiry Form) each of data and documents or just data only that will be required to be migrated to the new system? Additionally, could the City elaborate on the extent of migration needed for each system?	All data resides in OASIS. Migration of data is from OASIS. All open claims need to be migrated.
18	Section III, B, 9. Data Migration: Could the City please clarify whether the vendor is expected to include the migration of older, inactive or redundant OASIS data and documents that are being archived into the data warehouse as part of the current scope for Phase 1 or include as part of Phase 2 or a future Phase?	Please refer to Data Warehouse Solution section of the RFP that is part of Phase 2.
19	Section III, B, 9. Data Migration: Could the City please confirm whether there is an established process for determining when new claims are ready for archiving and subsequent transfer to the data warehouse? Additionally, should the development and management of this process be included within Phase 1 or 2 scope for ongoing data archiving operations?	There is no current process.

20	Section III, B, 11. Reporting: How many of the 260 reports should be considered as key reports for operational use and will be prioritized? Can you provide a description of what these reports will include?	Please refer to Page # 16 of the RFP. The immediate priority reports will be defined during the requirement analysis phase.
21	Section III, B, 11. Reporting: Although reports will be prioritized, should the vendor scope the replacement of all 260 reports as part of Phase 1?	Please see response to question 20 above.
22	Section III, C, 1. Overview: Could the City please confirm whether the vendor should focus solely on claims data for the data warehouse, or if other OAISIS data should also be included in scope? If additional data is to be incorporated, could the City provide an overview of this data?	Only Claims data is in scope
23	Section III, D, 2. Implementation Services: Training is defined in the implementation services. Does this include training for BLA internal staff only or include any external parties?	Training is for the internal staff.
24	Section III, D, 2. Implementation Services: For the training, what type of training does the City require, such as, onsite workshops, online/virtual training, recorded sessions, training guides?	The City is open to all of these types of trainings (workshops, online/virtual, recorded sessions and training guides).
25	Section III, D, 2. Implementation Services: Knowledge Transfer is defined in the implementation services. Is this knowledge transfer to IT staff only that would be manage the application for the future? Do these already have pre-existing knowledge of certain platforms (i.e., Microsoft Power Apps, Salesforce, Service Now...etc.) and if so, which ones?	The Knowledge Transfer is for IT staff and business users. Pre-existing knowledge of proposed platforms is not expected from users.

26	Section III, E Maintenance Services and Support Services: Could the City clarify whether technical support for end users is intended for NYC Comptroller staff, external claimants and portal users, or both?	Both
27	Section III, E Maintenance Services and Support Services: Is the vendor providing Tier 1, Tier 2 or Tier 3 technical support for the system?	Yes
28	Section III, E Maintenance Services and Support Services: Is there an expectation for the vendor to maintain a support desk with standard operating hours from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST?	Yes
29	Exhibit A, Claims Processing Business Capability Model Table: Could the City clarify whether the functionality specified for the “Enable Claimant Status Dashboard & Self Service” that has “(Future Capability)” should be included in the Phase 1 scope of the current proposal?	Yes
30	Exhibit A, Claims Processing Business Capability Model Table: Could the City confirm whether an existing identity management software is designated for portal authentication, or if the vendor is expected to propose and include a solution as part of the implementation?	Currently, there is no existing Portal. We expect proposer to provide a solution as part of the implementation.

31	Exhibit A, Claims Processing Business Capability Model Table: Could the City clarify what is meant by "facilitating the payment of medical bills" in the "Manage No-Fault Claims" section? Specifically, could you provide details on the expected process by which the claims processing solution will review, process, and execute payments for medical bills?	The City utilizes a 3rd party vendor in which the current claim system is integrated with the third party vendor's system - this integration allows for the fee scheduling and adjusting of medical bills received on 1st Party No Fault claims. The medical bills received on 1st Party No Fault claims are uploaded into the 3rd party vendor's system and claim examiner will adjust the medical bills in the system. The 3rd party vendor will send out the corresponding correspondence (Explanation of Benefits, Denial etc.) and associated payment to the medical provider and then upload this information back into the current system. The City is open to greater efficiencies on this process for the new system.
32	Exhibit C, Non-Functional Requirements Table: Could the City please provide the documentation for the NYC OTI Security Accreditation process required to be completed prior to go-live?	Please refer https://www.nyc.gov/content/oti/pages/vendor-resources/cybersecurity-requirements-for-vendors-contractors
33	Exhibit C, Non-Functional Requirements Table: Could the City please confirm which authentication provider is being used to support Single Sign-On (SSO) as part of the centralized identity, authorization, and access management solution for internal City staff users accessing the application?	Microsoft Entra SSO
34	General: What productivity applications does the City currently use (ie. Google Docs, Gmail, Microsoft Apps, Exchange)?	The Office currently uses Microsoft Applications.

35	Data Migration Requirements: Beyond the overall data volumes provided (e.g., 33,000 claims, 0.5 TB structured data, 13.34 TB unstructured data), how is data segmented between active and historical claims?	Data segmentation rules will be discussed during requirement phase of the project.
36	Data Migration Requirements: What specific transformation and cleansing rules are required to standardize legacy data (for example, addressing inconsistencies or missing values) before ingestion into the new system?	Data standarding rules and transformation rules depend on the new system. These will be discussed during requirement phase of the project.
37	Data Migration Requirements: Are there defined data mapping documents or business rules that must be implemented, and are there any planned incremental migration phases?	Yes. Business rules will be defined during requirement phase of the project. There are no planning incremental migration phases. Migration will be a one time activity.
38	Integration Interfaces: For each critical integration (e.g., with FMS, Mitchell DecisionPoint, Law Department systems), can you provide detailed technical specifications such as data formats, expected payload sizes, exchange frequency (real-time versus batch), and protocols (e.g., REST, SOAP, SFTP)?	Detailed Technical specification will be provided during requirement phase of the project.
39	Integration Interfaces: What are the defined error handling, logging, and retry mechanisms expected for these interfaces?	These details will be discussed during requirement phase of the project.
40	Cloud Platform and Hosting Model: Although the RFP confirms a 100% cloud-based solution, can you clarify the detailed infrastructure expectations (e.g., specific multi-region redundancy, load balancing, and disaster recovery configurations)?	Proposer can recommend a solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP and used in similar implementations.

41	Cloud Platform and Hosting Model: Are there any mandated architecture patterns (even in the absence of a preferred cloud provider) such as usage of specific cloud services for orchestration, storage, or security management?	There are no mandated architecture patterns. Proposer can recommend a solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP
42	Performance, Scalability, and Availability: What are the specific performance benchmarks expected for core transactions (for example, maximum allowable response time for claim status queries or document uploads under peak loads)?	Please refer to https://www.nyc.gov/assets/oti/downloads/pdf/vendor-resources/citywide-policy-for-performance-testing-of-public-facing-applicationsv2_1.pdf
43	Performance, Scalability, and Availability: Beyond user counts, do you have defined peak load scenarios (e.g., maximum simultaneous claim submissions) and stress testing parameters that the solution must sustain?	Currently there are no Peak load parameters define.
44	Performance, Scalability, and Availability: Can you provide more detailed Recovery Time Objectives (RTO) and Recovery Point Objectives (RPO) to validate system scalability and availability under disaster recovery conditions?	Please refer to Exhibit C Non-Functional Requirements (Performance Category) and Appendix D.
45	Workflow and Process Automation: Can you describe in greater detail the intended use of purposeful AI and Robotic Process Automation (RPA)? For instance, should the system automatically detect duplicate claims, trigger alerts for manual review, or support chatbot-based user interactions?	Proposer can recommend a solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP and used in similar implementations.

46	Workflow and Process Automation: What are the orchestration requirements for automating end-to-end workflows—including scheduling, dependency management, and exception handling—and are there specific tools or frameworks already preferred?	Proposer can recommend a solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP and used in similar implementations.
47	Security Infrastructure and Certifications: Beyond the stated moderate FedRAMP certification, are additional certifications (e.g., SOC 2 Type II, ISO 27001) required or strongly recommended for this project?	The Office will conduct a security assessment during our cloud review process.
48	Security Infrastructure and Certifications: What specific technologies or standards must be used for data encryption at rest and in transit (e.g., FIPS-validated modules), and are there detailed key management practices specified?	Please refer to sec Appendix D VI- 6.1.
49	Risk and Vulnerability Management: What is the expected frequency and scope of vulnerability scanning and penetration testing? Should vendors propose a continuous monitoring strategy as part of their implementation?	Please refer to Sec 4.7 ad 4.8 of Cloud Agreement
50	Risk and Vulnerability Management: Are there defined protocols for remediating identified vulnerabilities, and what are the turnaround expectations for security patching?	Critical and High vulnerabilities should be addressed immediately without undue delay, while Medium and Low vulnerabilities have remediation periods of 30-60 days.
51	Disaster Recovery and Incident Response: Risk and Vulnerability Management: Please detail the desired failover mechanism. What specific mechanisms (e.g., automated switchover, manual intervention) and validation	We do expect Automated switchover however the disaster recovery location has to remain within continental US.

	processes are expected during recovery scenarios?	
52	Disaster Recovery and Incident Response: How should incident response be documented and tested, and what are the requirements for post-incident reporting and lessons learned?	Please refer to Appendix G (What to do in case of Security Incident).
53	Operational Reporting Requirements: Are there predefined templates or KPIs that the solution must automatically generate, and how frequently must these reports be refreshed?	There are no predefined templates or KPI that need to be established at this time.
54	Data Warehouse and Analytics Capabilities: What is the business need / requirement for a data warehouse, in addition to the core system? Is the City open to meeting the functionality through the core system, instead of a separate data warehouse?	Please refer to Section III, C - Data Warehouse Solution.
55	Data Warehouse and Analytics Capabilities: What level of self-service functionality is required for business users? Should the solution support ad hoc querying, scheduled reporting, and direct integration with BI tools like Power BI and Excel?	Yes
56	Data Warehouse and Analytics Capabilities: Are advanced analytics or predictive modeling capabilities envisioned to drive proactive risk management, and what data preparation requirements (e.g., dimensional modeling, real-time data ingestion) does that entail?	Although advanced analytic sand predictive modeling aren't an explicit RFP requirement, proposers may suggest solutions incorporating them if they best meet the outlined needs.