# ADDENDUM NO. 6

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

**PIN:** 01525BIST72560

**Date:** June 5, 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. **REVISED REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) DOCUMENT.**

   Attachment C Price Proposal Form has been updated and is attached to this addendum.

   Part 2, Licensing, **d. Claims Solution** has been deleted.

THE REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

## 2. COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS:

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

| | Question | Answer |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Is there a Data Quality solution implemented in the current system? Are there external tools that perform Data quality for you? If so, please list them. Would you like to retain those tools in future state (on GCP)? If no tool is in place for implementing Data quality, what approaches and solutions have been tried? What additional features would you like implemented in the future solution? | Currently, there is no data warehousing tool in place. The proposer can recommend a solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP. |
| 2 | How frequently are the encryption keys rotated? | This information will be disclosed to the awarded contractor. |
| 3 | Are you using any key management solution such as Hashicorp Vault / Fortanix? | There are no Key management solutions that are currently being used for Claims application. |
| 4 | Would GCP services need to be accessible from on-premise? | Yes, we expect GCP services to be accessible from on-premise. |
| 5 | Where does the DNS resolution occur? | The current solution is internal and is not public facing, hence there is no DNS resolution. |
| 6 | Does the data to be migrated in phase 1, which consists of claims data, come solely from an Oracle ODA system, or are there other data sources involved? What is the format and volume of this data? Will this be a one-time migration, or will there be ongoing migrations? | We expect data migration to be part of Phase 1. Data that needs to be migrated is currently stored in Oracle database and file storage system. We expect both - data in the Oracle database and the files on the file storage system to be part of migration. We expect this to be a one-time migration. Migration requirements can be discussed during the requirement phase. Please refer to page 15 Section 3, Scope of Work and M/WBE Requirements, Item 9 of RFP. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7 | Will there be any requirement to attach images of damaged pathways, accident spots, videos as evidence, etc.? If so, please explain with an example of the complete flow and how these images or videos would be evaluated. Will this be a manual process, or will processing with AI/ML to identify relevant incidents/reasoning is required? | Please refer question 46 in Addendum 1. |
| 8 | Please confirm how we should address the sample contract and related documents (e.g., SLAs) in our response. Should we include our exceptions as part of our response or can we state that we acknowledge the sample documents and understand that both parties reserve their rights to negotiate at time of contract award? We appreciate clarification on how to respond to the sample documents. | Appendices were included in the RFP for Proposer awareness. Proposers may opt to append to its response any exceptions to the standard City-wide language included in the RFP appendices. However, Proposers should be aware that the contract and its appendices are standard City-wide language, so changes or exceptions to the language may not be accepted by the Comptroller's Office. Further, any changes to standard City-wide language requires the approval of the NYC Law Department, Department of Technology and Information, and/or Chief Privacy Officer. |
| 9 | What are the current set of testing tools and technologies being used by NYC controller for the below types of testing?<br>a) Functional Testing<br>b) Automation Testing<br>c) API Testing<br>d) Test Management<br>e) Performance Testing<br>f) Accessibility Testing<br>g) Data Warehouse/Data Migration Testing | We expect the proposer to recommend testing tools. |
| 10 | Is the 30% MWBE target applicable to the overall contract value or only on professional services? I.e., Is the target applicable only to the Part 1 Implementation and Part 3 Maintenance services categories in Attachment C Price Proposal form? | The 30% MWBE subcontracting goal applies to the overall contract value listed in the "Total Fixed Price Proposal" in Attachment C, Price Proposal Form. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 11 | Can the Comptroller's office please elaborate the written permission requirements and other policies and processes noted in Appendix G related to written permission to access City Technology Assets remotely? Are there any remote restrictions or on-site requirements for any positions/project roles to be aware of? | The proposer is not allowed to access Comptroller data unless previously approved in writing. Email for approval must be sent to otcsupport@comptroller.nyc.gov. Additional details will be provided after contract award. |
| 12 | Are there any roles outside of those that participate in the claims process who should receive Organizational Change Management and Training efforts? | Yes |
| 13 | What is the planned program management structure, and how is change management integrated into this structure? | Please refer to Section IV. Proposal Format and Requirements, B. Proposal Format, 1 Technical Proposal, 1.2.4.1 Project Management Implementation Methodology. |
| 14 | Have you conducted any change readiness assessments? If so, can you share the findings? | Yes, a change of readiness assessment was conducted. Findings are confidential and will be shared with the contractor after the contract is awarded. |
| 15 | Are there existing change champions or advocates within the organization whom we can leverage? | No |
| 16 | What dependencies or concurrent initiatives outside of the OAISIS program should we be aware of that could impact the OAISIS timeline or activities? | There are no initiatives outside of OAISIS that are currently being implemented and have impact on OAISIS activities or timelines. |
| 17 | How would you describe the appetite for change within the Office of the Comptroller, e.g. there is a lot of change fatigue and resistance to change, or there is a comfort level with change, and we are becoming more proficient at managing the change? | The Agency has a good appetite for change - it is clear that the current system is outdated, and it is critical for the Agency to have a new system. |
| 18 | Can you provide a breakdown of the roles of the 700 internal City users (including Comptroller and other Agency users) who need to be trained on the new Claims Processing Solution, e.g., how many Examiners require training? | All users (Comptroller/other Agencies/Law Firms) who are using the current Claim application system will need Training. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 19 | Does the Office of the Comptroller currently use any sort of digital adoption platform (e.g., Epilogue Opus, WalkMe, Whatfix, etc.) and if so, which tool does it use? | No |
| 20 | Does the Office of the Comptroller currently use a Learning Management System (i.e., LMS) and if so, which LMS does it use? | No |
| 21 | Are there any union considerations or labor agreements related to the training and implementation of the new Claims Processing Solution? | As long the new system allows for the assignment of claims and associated tasks to Union staff within their title, there should be no issue. |
| 22 | Can the Comptroller's office elaborate on its current document management solution and processes? What tools/systems are in use and what are their capabilities and limitations? | OAISIS is a document management system. |
| 23 | Should proposers' factor in the cost of software/licenses already available to the City as part of their proposals (no net additional cost)? E.g., there is a Citywide agreement for NYC to utilize Informatica. | Please refer to question 41in Addendum 1. |
| 24 | New York City has licensing agreements with Informatica and other software vendors for ETL and other tools that will be required for the project. Will any of the City's preferred purchasing vehicles/contracts be available to utilize as part of this project to get preferential pricing and realize savings for the implementation? | No |
| 25 | Will the Comptroller's Office be procuring all the software the selected vendor proposes, or will the vendor be expected to provide/resell? The City may be able to achieve significant savings by purchasing through existing contracts only available to the City/governments. | Please refer to question 41 in Addendum 1. |
| 26 | Is Data Doing Business Data Form required for only the prime proposer or subcontractors as well? | The Data Doing Business Data Form is only required for the prime contractor. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 27 | "Attachment C Price Proposal requests pricing for 'Claims Solution' under Part 2 Licensing twice, under sub-bullets A and D. Can the Comptroller's office confirm this is correct or revise the categories of licensing pricing required? | Please refer to Section 1 of this Addendum. A revised Attachment C Price Proposal has been attached to this addendum. |
| 28 | Does the Comptroller's office have any preferred tools that should be a part of the vendor solution? | No. There are no preferred tools. |
| 29 | Will NYC comptroller accept reduced errors and omission insurance than 20million aggregate? | The contract resulting from this RFP shall require cyber liability insurance with limits of at least $10,000,000 per occurrence and $20,000,000 in the aggregate. The final limits will be determined by the agency. |
| 30 | Will NYC Comptroller grant an extension for due date? | Please refer to Addendum 5. The proposal due date has been changed to June 17, 2025. |
| 31 | Are there specific pain points or bottlenecks in the existing claims processing lifecycle we should address? | The current system tracks the status of the claim when the end user is in the claim along with providing notifications when a new document has been uploaded into a claim file. However, there is no connection between the current system and the end user receiving notifications or alerts via emails. It is a system created in 1995 and there are limitations in the interfacing of the current system and products such as email. Ease of use in terms of communications, alerts and interfacing with other systems such as email is a goal of the new system. |
| 32 | Should the system support mobile-responsive public intake portals or mobile apps? | Please refer to Section III. Scope of Work and M/WBE Requirements, B Claims Processing Solution, 5. Common Functional Requirement Overview, i. Intake and File on page 9. |
| 33 | Are multilingual intake forms required? | See Page 66, Exhibit C Non Functional Requirements, Compliance 34. |
| 34 | Can we use open-source components (e.g., PostgreSQL, Elasticsearch) if properly secured and supported? | The proposer can propose any solution that meets the requirements outlined in the RFP. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 35 | Do you require the use of low-code platforms, or is custom development needed from scratch? | The proposer can propose any solution that meets the requirements outlined in the RFP. |
| 36 | Are there any mandatory frameworks, libraries, or development guidelines from NYC OTI or Cyber Command? | Please refer to Appendix D: Cloud Agreement Terms and Conditions for Cloud Services, Appendix E: Privacy Protection Rider, Appendix F: Identifying Information Rider, Appendix G: Security Requirements, and Appendix I: Software End-User License Agreement. |
| 37 | What volume of historical data (in GB/TB) must be migrated to the new system and warehouse? | Please refer to the response in question 8 above. |
| 38 | Is multi-tenant architecture needed, or must this be a single-tenant deployment? | We prefer a multi-tenant architecture; however, the proposer can recommend a single-tenant architecture if that fits the needs of the Office. |
| 39 | Will document storage be handled on NYC-managed infrastructure or must it be included in our cloud solution? | Yes, we expected a cloud-based solution to handle document storage. |
| 40 | Should the system support integration with NYC Law Department systems for litigation tracking? | Yes |
| 41 | Is there a required migration of business logic or rules from OAISIS/eClaims into the new system? | No |
| 42 | Will the proposed solution need to handle payment approvals, fund disbursement, or just pre-payment authorization? | Yes |
| 43 | Are there legacy integration points for which documentation is not yet available? | No |
| 44 | Is there a standard data retention policy for claims, attachments, and logs? | All Data must be retained in the proposed solution or in the data warehouse. |
| 45 | What document retention and archival policies should be built into the system? | All Data must be retained in the proposed solution or in the data warehouse. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 46 | What types of user notifications are needed (e.g., SMS, email, portal-based alerts)? | We expect emails and portal-based alerts to be part of the solution, however, the proposer can recommend additional modes of communication/notifications. |
| 47 | Is collaborative review needed (multiple reviewers commenting or annotating one claim)? | Yes |
| 48 | Is integration with digital signature platforms (e.g., DocuSign, Adobe Sign) expected? | Yes. Please refer to Exhibit D List of Integrations. |
| 49 | What are the integration protocols available for NYCityPay, Lien Verifiers, and Legal Systems (API, SOAP, file exchange)? | There are no integration points to any of the systems listed in this question. |
| 50 | How document versioning will be there i.e. with document name or with document content (document id). | The proposer can recommend a document versioning that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP and used in similar implementations. |
| 51 | Should users be allowed to submit video/audio evidence? If yes, is there a max size or format? | Please refer to question 46 in Addendum 1. |
| 52 | Do you expect version control or change history for submitted documents? | This is not a requirement, however, version control and change history for documents is preferred. |
| 53 | Should internal staff be able to annotate or comment directly on documents? | Yes |
| 54 | Should the system support automated scoring or rule-based routing for certain claim types? | Yes |
| 55 | Do you require full-text search across claim descriptions, documents and notes? | Yes |
| 56 | Will handwritten claim forms be reliably digitized? | All handwritten claims and related documents are digitally scanned in claims application. |
| 57 | Will any temporary or external reviewer access be required (e.g., auditors or legal contractors)? | Yes |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 58 | Can you provide real-life claim volumes: average claims per day/week/month, peak load, and annual growth expectations? | Please refer to Section III. Scope of Work and M/WBE Requirements, C. Data Warehouse Solution, 2. Current Claims Data Landscape on page 16 and the Annual Claims report on NYC Comptrollers website for additional information: Annual Claims Report: https://comptroller.nyc.gov/reports/annual-claims-report/ |
| 59 | What are the top user complaints from public users and internal staff? | There have not been any complaints from public users since the current system has only been accessible by Office of Comptroller employees or to a limited extent to outside agencies. For internal staff, top complaints include integration issues between the system and Microsoft outlook when wanting to upload emails and attachments to the claim file, lack of scalability of an older system, clunkiness of the system etc. |
| 60 | Will OCS provide access to NYCityPay, Legal Case System, Lien Check, FMS APIs, or should we simulate? | The Office will assist the contractor to access all the integration points identified in the RFP during development phase. |
| 61 | Can we use a hybrid stack (e.g., low-code BPM for workflows + custom UI + DB)? | The proposer can propose any solution that meets the requirements outlined in the RFP. |
| 62 | Will OCS manage the cloud subscription, or should we include hosting in our proposal? | Please include hosting in your proposal. |
| 63 | What is the source format and structure of OAISIS and eClaims data (e.g., Oracle DB, CSV exports)? | The source format can be scanned documents, electronically submitted documents. eClaims data resides in a PDF and in oracle database. |
| 64 | Will the City provide a data dictionary for existing systems, or should vendors reverse engineer? | Yes |
| 65 | Are attachments from OAISIS extractable in bulk, and what formats are they in (PDF, JPG, TIFF)? | Attachments are in multiple formats (PDF, TIFF, excel, word etc.). Currently there is no solution to bulk extract documents. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 66 | Should we preserve legacy claim IDs, or will new system-generated IDs be acceptable? | The current Claim ID format is working well for the Office. We prefer to continue with current Claim ID format. For consistency and legacy, it is important to keep the same claim IDs. |
| 67 | Will NYC sign a mutual NDA if proprietary algorithms or AI models are used? | Yes |
| 68 | Should the source code be shared if any proprietary tools are used as part of the solution? | Yes |
| 69 | What are the methods of intake beyond portal? Email, phone, in person? | All modes of intake are allowed |
| 70 | What is the city's financial payment system built on? Proprietary? | It is a proprietary system. |
| 71 | Are the pdf documents standardized? Uniform? | No |
| 72 | What is the platform that is intended to be used for electronic signatures? (e.g. DocuSign, Adobe signature etc.) | Please refer to Exhibit D List of Integrations. |
| 73 | Are standard API available to be used for integrations, including Webservices (REST/SOAP API's)? | Most integration points use SFTP and some use webservice. Relevant documentation will be provided during the requirements phase of the project. |
| 74 | Is there a requirement to streamline some of the reporting in place, considering 260 reports are currently in use? | Please refer to Section III. Scope of Work and M/WBE Requirements, B Claims Processing Solution, 11 Reporting on page 15-16. |
| 75 | Are all the PII data tables considered for the application, and do they need to be defined based on various user roles? | The proposer can propose any solution that meets the requirements outlined in the RFP. |
| 76 | Will the government extend the due date by two weeks to allow more time to adjust our response based on Q&A responses? | Please refer to Addendum 5. The proposal due date has been changed to June 17, 2025. |
| 77 | What is the estimated number of concurrent internal and external users to aid with sizing the system? | We expect around 100-200 concurrent system users (internal and external). This does not include users accessing portal to submit Claims. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 78 | The City desires a cloud-based solution and mentioned that the hosting environment needed to be FedRAMP. Are there requirements for the entire platform to be FedRAMP Authorized and listed within the GSA FedRAMP Marketplace? | FEDRAMP in progress is also acceptable. |
| 79 | For the bi-directionally integration with the City's payment system (FMS), are there published APIs for integration and will the FMS' team be available to support the integration? For the current system, how many APIs are being used for the integration? | The FMS integration point uses SFTP connection. |
| 80 | For the bi-directional integration with the Law Department system, are there published APIs for integration of this system and will the team be available to support the integration? For the current system, how many APIs are being used for the integration? | The Law Dept integration point uses SFTP connection. |
| 81 | For the bi-directional integration with Legal Straus, are there published APIs for the integration of this system and will the team be available to support the integration? For the current system, how many APIs are being used for the integration? | There is no interface currently to Legal Stratus. |
| 82 | For the current BPM system, is it compliant with Business Process Model Notation (BPMN 2.0) such that we can export the existing processes and reuse in our system? Can the processes be exported to a vendor neutral format like XML? | No |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 83 | For the 260 reports, is there a set of reports that have to be available when the system goes live versus a set that can be developed during O&M? If so, what percentage has to be available at Go Live? | At this time, we do not have specific reports being generated and accordingly, there are no specific reports that have to be available when the new System goes live. However, once the new Contractor/System is selected, the Office will be interested in the canned reports that are available for immediate production and the Contractor/System's ability to create new reports. |
| 84 | Should the vendor propose an invoicing schedule based on the Price Proposal Form and the Deliverables under F. KEY DELIVERABLES? | Proposers can propose an invoicing schedule; however, the office reserves the right to change the scheduled during contract negotiations. |
| 85 | If the vendor is a certified MBE, does the vendor need to complete the Schedule B - M/WBE Utilization Plan? | Yes |
| 86 | Is the City procuring this solution under a specific contract vehicle or master services agreement? | No |
| 87 | Will preference be given to vendors already contracted with the City of New York? | No |
| 88 | Is there a defined budget range or ceiling for this project? | Please refer to question 45 in Addendum 1. |
| 89 | Is the City open to a modular solution that spans multiple integrated application? | Please refer to question 1 in Addendum 1. |
| 90 | Will a configurable commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) platform be considered, or is there preference for custom development? | We welcome all solutions that best align with the requirements outlined in the RFP. Please refer to Section III Scope of Work and M/WBE Requirements, D Implementation and Maintenance Services on page 18. |
| 91 | Can the City clarify its preferred integration approach (e.g., real-time APIs, middleware, batch)? | Real-time API's are preferred, however, if real-time is not possible, we are open to other solutions. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 92 | Can vendors propose a phased rollout (e.g., Phase 1: Claims System, Phase 2: Data Warehouse), or must all components be delivered simultaneously? | Yes, we are open to a phased approach. |
| 93 | What are the specific workflows that must be supported in the new Claims Processing Solution (e.g., intake, investigation, adjudication, appeals, payment)? | Please refer to Exhibit B Journey Maps. |
| 94 | Is the claims process standardized across departments, or do multiple workflows need to be supported for different claim types or agencies? | Multiple workflows will be needed to support different Claim Types. |
| 95 | Are there service-level agreements (SLAs) for claims processing that the new system must support or enforce? | Our office currently has a Memorandum of Understanding with a number of city agencies which allow these agencies to review Notices of Claims that are filed against their respective agency. We do not have SLA with any outside contractors, but we have an agreement with a fee scheduling software company that interfaces with the current system and allows for the adjusting of medical bills on 1st Party No Fault claims. Also, the new system must be able to query outside agencies to see if any liens are owed by the claimant (Child Support, Medicare, Department of Finance etc.). |
| 96 | Will the system need to support multi-party claims or claims involving multiple agencies, entities, or departments? | Yes, the system will need to support claims in which the allegations against multiple agencies or defendants. |
| 97 | Is there a requirement for automated notifications, escalations, or approval routing based on claim type or risk? | Yes |
| 98 | What types of documents or file types are typically attached to a claim (e.g., legal PDFs, images, scanned forms)? | Please refer to question 46 in Addendum 1. |
| 99 | Should the system allow for bulk claim imports or batch entry, or is it all case-by-case manual entry? | Yes, the system should allow bulk claim imports. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 100 | How is claims fraud detection or investigative tracking handled today? Is there a requirement for audit trails or risk scoring? | There is no claim fraud detection system in place because fraud is dependent on the allegations raised in the claim and the current system does not have OCR scanning which may allow for that type of detection. We run reports to determine if there are duplicate claims filed. There is definitely a need for an audit trail on any changes that are made to a claim file along with the ability to assess who is accessing a claim file. Additionally, there needs to be an audit trail for the granting/approval of settlement authority along with the payment process when a matter is settled. |
| 101 | Will users need the ability to flag or reclassify claims mid-process? | Yes |
| 102 | What level of reporting or analytics is expected for claims (e.g., real-time dashboards, litigation trends, compliance summaries)? | We expect the contractor to provide real-time dashboards, trends, and compliance summaries. We also have in-house Power BI dashboard analytics. Data from the proposed solution should be accessible to the in-house Power BI platform. |
| 103 | Is integration required with any external claims-related systems, such as financial systems for payments or legal databases for case status? | Yes |
| 104 | What roles or personas will interact with the system (e.g., intake clerk, legal reviewer, compliance officer)? | Please refer to Exhibit B Journey Maps. |
| 105 | Will the new solution need to replace all five legacy applications (OAISIS, Public eClaim, DOE eClaim, BIST Invoice Portal, Judgment Inquiry Form) at once, or will this occur in phases? | All legacy applications should be replaced at once. |
| 106 | What training or change management strategies are envisioned for onboarding 700 internal users and 40,000+ external users to the new platform? | We expect proposers to provide in-class training and online training to on board 700 system users. We expect the contractor to provide online user manuals for external users. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 107 | Are there differences in workflow, review process, or documentation required between Real Property, Tort, and Labor-related claims that the platform needs to support distinctly? | Please refer to Exhibit B Journey Maps. |
| 108 | How much flexibility do you anticipate needing to modify workflows, approval chains, or forms after go-live without custom development? | The solution should be flexible enough to allow comptroller administrators to modify workflows, approval chains, forms without any custom development after go live. |
| 109 | Will a platform authorized under FedRAMP Moderate or High satisfy the City's security requirements? | Please refer to question 6 in Addendum 1. |
| 110 | What tools or platforms are currently used to manage the 13+ TB of unstructured legacy data from OAISIS? | Currently, there are no external tools to manage unstructured data. |
| 111 | Is there flexibility to leverage built-in analytics (e.g., ServiceNow Performance Analytics) in place of Power BI for dashboards and reporting? | Proposer can leverage any built-in data analytics as a complimentary solution to the in-house Power BI platform. However, the Inhouse Power BI must have access to data from the new system |
| 112 | Can the City confirm the core user groups and their roles (e.g., Claimants, Comptroller Staff, Law Dept., DOE, Other Agencies)? | Comptroller staff will have the ability to review and adjust the claims. The Law Department will have access to all the claim data and documents except anything involving internal authority and analysis. Outside agencies will have the ability to review Notices of Claim involving their specific agency. Outside law firms retained to conduct 50-h hearings on behalf of the Comptroller, will have access to the claim file documents of the claims that are assigned to the firm for a hearing. It is anticipated that a claimant will have the ability to see the documents they have provided to support their claim along with checking the status of their claim. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 113 | What are the City's expectations around governance and change management, particularly for multi-agency coordination? | Outside agencies where there is a Memorandum of Understanding are provided with access to the Claim System will have the ability to review Notices of Claims that involve their specific agency. |
| 114 | Can you clarify the desired level of self-service and transparency for claimants? Should they be able to upload evidence, receive status updates, and interact digitally throughout the claim lifecycle? | It is anticipated for the claimant to have the ability to see the documents they have provided to support their claim along with checking the status of their claim. |
| 115 | How stable are the workflows? | The workflows are very stable. |
| 116 | How frequently do new workflows/claim types get added? | There is rarely any change to the Claim Types. However, there could be changes in workflows based on business needs. |
| 117 | What ability will the team have to integrate with the existing system? | There is no requirement to integrate with the existing OAISIS Claims system. |
| 118 | What is the tolerance for going to production early? (Can we replace one feature at a time and deploy to production?) | No. The proposed solution should be fully functional. |
| 119 | Why would a claim or the way it's handled change? What would precipitate that change? | The status of the claim can change based on a number of factors. A claim status could be disallowed for failure to be in compliance with GML 50-e, can be cancelled because it is a duplicate claim, or can be withdrawn by the claimant. Additionally, the claim status could be discontinued because the statute of limitations has expired or the claim or has a status of action started because the claimant has commenced litigation on the claim that was filed. |
| 120 | What level of access would we have to users re: UAT, feedback? | There is no level of access level defined at the moment. This can be discussed with the contractor post contract award. |
| 121 | What is the tolerance for having a small group of end users involved in sprint review? (Having a pilot group) | Yes, end users will be part of sprint review to validate the functionality. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 122 | What challenges has the city encountered when attempting to de-duplicate claims in the current system? | The City has not encountered any challenges. |
| 123 | What type of files represents the non-structured data? | Please refer to question 46 in Addendum 1. |
| 124 | How many duplicate claims are filed every year? | Less than 1% per year. |
| 125 | What level of end-user training is expected (e.g., train-the-trainer, direct user training, ongoing support)? | Please refer to the response for question 106 above. |
| 126 | What are the top three challenges with the current system the City expects this modernization to solve? | Ease of use such as integration with Outlook or a diary system, scalability, and the ability to run reports to allow management to manage and measure performance of staff. |
| 127 | Are there specific claim types or business functions the City wants prioritized in the initial release? | All claim types and related business functions must be available at the time of initial release. |
| 128 | Does the City have a target timeline for initiating and completing the Data Warehouse Solution (Phase 2)? | Timelines will be discussed with selected contractor post contract award |
| 129 | Given the brief time frame between the proposal due date and the closing date for vendor questions, is it possible to obtain a two-week extension to the deadline to allow us to incorporate any responses to questions? | Please refer to Addendum 5. The proposal due date has been changed to June 17, 2025. |
| 130 | What specific performance targets should we meet (e.g., response times, maximum concurrent user load), especially considering the estimated 40,000 external users? | We expect the solution to follow industry standard UX design response times and performance. |
| 131 | Given that only 'active' claims data will be migrated to the new system, should we design a workflow or utility to extract these active historical claims from OAISIS and automatically route them through the new system's approval process? Could you please clarify how you envision handling the approval and integration of historical claims that are still active? | Yes. All active claims data should be migrated to the new system. The approval and workflow process of the new system should be used for handling these active claims. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 132 | The RFP mentions that scanned documents will be processed with OCR to enable text searchability. Could you please confirm if this OCR processing is expected to also extract handwritten text from images, or is it intended only for printed text? | Wherever possible OCR processing should be enabled, independent of the type of document |
| 133 | Should claim categories be customizable by the user, or will they be fixed using the preset taxonomy? | Claim Categories will be fixed using the preset taxonomy. |
| 134 | Can you provide more detailed rules for how claims are currently assigned to investigators or teams, including any escalation or re-assignment protocols? | Please refer to Exhibit B Journey Maps. |
| 135 | Should the claim intake portal support multilingual submissions or include additional accessibility features (such as ADA compliance)? | See Page 66, Exhibit C Non Functional Requirements, Compliance 34. |
| 136 | Can you provide further details on the integration protocols for Legal Stratus and FMS (e.g., whether REST, SOAP, or another standard is used)? | Please refer to question 46 in Addendum 1. |
| 137 | Will we have access to NYC's Identity Management platform for implementing SSO and role-based access, or should we plan for an independent solution? | Yes, the selected contractor will be provided with access to the Comptroller's Identity management Platform, however, role-based access must be controlled at the new system level. |
| 138 | Does the system need to support uploads of audio/video evidence, or will it only handle traditional document formats? | Please refer to question 46 in Addendum 1. |
| 139 | Can closed claims be reopened? If so, under what specific conditions or workflows? | Yes, a closed claim can be opened. For example, if a claim is closed because the claim was filed late under GML 50e, the claimant can seek leave of the court to file a Late Notice of Claim. If the Court approves, the claimant will have the ability to file a Late Notice of Claim and if it is filed, it will reopen the previously closed claim. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 140 | For multi-party claims (involving multiple agencies or external partners), how should the workflow be structured? | It is not a workflow consideration for outside agencies - outside agencies just need access to certain aspects of a claim file. The only situation where an examiner and an outside entity are working on the same claim file are those claims that are sent to our retained outside counsel who is tasked to conduct a 50-h hearing on those claims assigned to the firm. A workflow would have to be created to allow for an examiner and the outside firm to work on the same claim. |
| 141 | What is the current database from which the data needs to be migrated? | Oracle |
| 142 | How many years of data is Comptroller expecting us to migrate? | Please refer to the response to question 8 above. |
| 143 | Are there known data quality issues (duplicates, inconsistencies, nulls)? | No |
| 144 | Will the Comptroller be responsible for cleansing, or is this expected from us? | The contractor will be responsible for all data cleansing and data migration. |
| 145 | Is there a priority order of the integrations listed in Exhibit D? | No. The proposed solution should be fully functional with all integrations. |
| 146 | Will data from the sources listed in Exhibit D be integrated into the data warehouse and reporting, or integrated into the claims user interface, or both? | Both |
| 147 | Will the user interface need to include a list of a claim's files? Will users need to open or review the text of their documents that they have submitted as part of their claims. | Yes |
| 148 | On item B.5.iii.a there is a requirement "…and provide time-based ticklers based on claim type." What is meant by "a time-based tickler"? | Time based ticker system should allow ticklers (reminders, tasks, etc.) for important milestones or time sensitive events to a Claim and be notified of them in a timely manner in the future |
| 149 | Will data from unstructured files need to be query-able from the data warehouse? Or is the only need for them to be stored as files for retrieval/downloading as files? | The current unstructured data is not query-able. But we expect future unstructured data captured in the new system to be queryable from the data warehouse. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 150 | Section 3.C.2 Current Claims Data Landscape says "…including 275 GB of transactional data and a growth path to 400 GB of unstructured data." Is this a typographical error? If not, what is meant by growing to all of that unstructured data within the structured database to which this paragraph refers? What is that unstructured data composed of? | No. this is not a typographical error. The unstructured data refers to the data in files/documents that are captured during the OCR process and stored in the database. |
| 151 | Are there any requirements to store or otherwise segregate PII-containing tables from the rest of the database? Or can they be stored together with other data, but just given extra protection from exposure? | The is no requirement to segregate PII containing table. They can be stored together with additional access restrictions |
| 152 | Would it be possible to grant a two-week extension to the May 13, 2025, submission deadline? | Please refer to Addendum 5. The proposal due date has been changed to June 17, 2025. |
| 153 | While the RFP indicates that the OAISIS system uses an Oracle database for structured data, can you please confirm where the unstructured data (files and documents) is currently stored? Are these files stored within the Oracle database, on a file server, or in a separate document management system? | The Files and documents are stored in File Server. |
| 154 | Could you please clarify what specific data and artifacts from the Public eClaim Portal are to be migrated? Does it share the same data store as OAISIS or a separate repository? | All data and documents captured in eClaims that are active are to be migrated for OAISIS to new system. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 155 | Could you please share the scope and nature of data that needs to be migrated from the following systems:<br>1) DOE eClaim Portal<br>2) BIST 50H Invoice Portal<br>3) Judgment and Claim Settlement Payment Inquiry Form | DOE eClaim Portal allows DOE to directly upload data to OAISIS. The eclaim forms are similar to the eclaims on NYC Comptroller website. The New system should allow DOE to submit claims electronically to Comptroller's office.<br>BIST 50h Invoice Portal is an in-house application that allows 3rd party Law firms to submit invoices for review/approval and payments. We expect the new system to allow third party Law Firms to create and submit invoices for review and approval.<br>Judgment and Claim Settlement Payment Inquiry Form is an inquiry form. Please visit NYC comptroller website to review this form. We expect the new system to allow Users to submit requests related to their claims. |
| 156 | We would appreciate more detailed information on the BIST 50H Invoice Portal and the Judgment and Claim Settlement Payment Inquiry Form, specifically:<br>1) What role will these components play in the newly designed system?<br>2) What workflows or user interactions are expected to be supported?<br>3) Are these expected to be integrated as distinct modules, or will they be incorporated within broader claims workflows? | Please refer to response to question 155 above. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 157 | Could you please provide more details regarding the proposed identity, authorization, and access management approach for the new solution? Specifically:<br>1) What platform will be used for Single Sign-On (SSO) for internal users? (we assume this is Azure AD)<br>2) What identity provider(s) or mechanism(s) will be used for authenticating external/public users accessing the eClaim portal? | 1. YES, Microsoft Entra SSO in Azure<br>2. External NYCID, Supported Federation Authentication Protocols - OAUTH 2.0, SAML 2.0, OIDC |
| 158 | Can you clarify how user roles and access will be managed for City agency users outside of the Comptroller's Office? | We expect a proposed solution to integrate with OTI's Identity Management. |
| 159 | Will the system be expected to generate templated letters (e.g., denial notices, offer letters, hearing notices)? If yes, how many letter templates are expected, and will samples be shared? | Yes. Approximately 50 - 60 letters. Sample will be shared after the contract award. |
| 160 | Are there any legal hold requirements for claims or associated documents that need to be enforced within the new system to prevent deletion or modification? | The Office expects all the associated documents to be stored and moved to the Data warehouse. |
| 161 | How comfortable are OAISIS system users in using agentic AI and recommender systems solutions in their day-to-day workflows? | Currently, there is no AI implemented in the current system. However, we are open to AI implementation in the new system. |
| 162 | Which sets of past behavioral, usage and qualitative data will be made available for designing solutions for evaluating claims processing using AI? | All existing historical data will be made available for Claims processing using AI. |
| 163 | Which personas are projected to be most comfortable, and which are least comfortable with using recommender systems, gamification and agentic AI in day-to-day workflows. | The proposer can recommend an AI model that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP and used in similar implementations. |
| 164 | What is the frequency of fraud, modalities of fraud, and current fraud mitigation strategies that we need to be aware of? | Fraud claims are filed but information on a fraudulent claim occurs via our external investigation or through reporting to the Agency by an outside source. We would like the new |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | system to have business intelligence to identify duplicate claims being filed. |
| 165 | What adversarial robustness testing need to be performed to confirm the system is rigorous to withstand intrusion, and which agency will be designing it? | The new system will have to go through the OTI Cloud review process to test the robustness of the solution. |
| 166 | Why is WCAG 2.2 not in scope of this RFP? | The City of New York adopted WCAG2.1. Even though Web content accessibility guidelines (WCAG 2.2) have not been explicitly scoped out, we would like the contractor to follow the WCAG 2.2 guidelines. |
| 167 | Is there a requirement for Data Cataloging and metadata management and how is this done currently is there a solution already in place ?<br>Is these logical grouping or labels of your data already defined? Can you please share details of these? | Currently, there is no data warehousing tool in place. The proposer can recommend a solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP. |
| 168 | Are MIT-licensed OSS browser-using agentic automation applications such as the browser-use ( https://github.com/browser-use/browser-use ) approved for use in this RFP? | Refer to the response for questions 165 above. |
| 169 | If browser-using applications are approved for use in this RFP, which standards of adversarial robustness testing and scale need to be passing for a solution to be considered. | Please refer to Exhibit C Non-Functional Requirements. |
| 170 | Could you please confirm if the use of offshore resources, specifically from Mexico and India, is permitted under this engagement? | The office will review all proposals and consider offshore resources. |
| 171 | We are a prospective vendor which has begun the M/WBE certification process. We expect to complete this process within the next 60 days. Can we use this information to count toward the M/WBE participation goals and M/WBE utilization plan? | All proposers must complete and submit Attachment E: Schedule B - Subcontractor Utilization Plan/Waiver Application form. A proposer must be Certified by NYC or NYS at the time of the proposal due date at time. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 172 | M/WBE participation goals do not specify what percentage should be assigned to an MBE participant and what percentage should be assigned to a WBE participant. Can the Comptroller's Office offer any clarification on how the participation goals should be assigned? Must an MBE prime contractor utilize a WBE subcontractor in order to satisfy the participation goals? | The M/WBE subcontracting goal is 30% unspecified. Proposers can use any certified M/WBE organizations to meet the goal. |
| 173 | The contract has a five-year life. Please clarify the point at which the contract period begins. | Please refer to Section 1, Key Dates and Information, Section F. Anticipated Contract State Date. |
| 174 | Does the office plan to keep the Kodak scanning solution for paper to digital with the new solution? | Yes |
| 175 | Is document validation needed? | Yes |
| 176 | Will online web forms be required? | Yes |
| 177 | Is the office working with any existing web form vendors? | Yes |
| 178 | Is document generation required? | Yes |
| 179 | Is the office working with any existing document generation tools? | No |
| 180 | In the "conceptual diagram" in the RFP it appears the new solution should connect to Oracle Image and PDF Repository. Is that accurate or will that be replaced by the new solution? | Only for Data migration to the new system and the data warehouse. |
| 181 | Does the office work with any AI tools today? If so, which tools? | Currently, no. |
| 182 | Will the office consider granting a 2 week extension to the RFP submission deadline since questions are due today and there won't be much time between when responses are posted, and the responses are due? | Please refer to Addendum 5. The proposal due date has been changed to June 17, 2025. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 183 | We are a federally certified Woman-Owned Small Business (WOSB). To qualify under NYC's MWBE program, must we also obtain New York State or NYC WBE certification, or will our federal WOSB status suffice for MWBE consideration? | Proposers and any subcontractors must be a New York City or New York State certified MWBE. |
| 184 | Clarification on Data Migration Scope: Can the agency confirm the volume and formats of legacy data to be migrated from OAISIS and eClaims, and whether historical data must be accessible within the new system or archived separately? | Please refer to the response to question 8 above. |
| 185 | Claim Categories and Use Case Prioritization: Can you provide a detailed list of claim categories (e.g., tort, labor, real property) that must be supported at go-live, and clarify if any should be deprioritized to future phases? | Please refer to Exhibit B Journey Maps section of the RFP. All claim categories must be supported at the time of go-live. |
| 186 | Integration Specifications for FMS and LegalStratus: What integration methods (API, flat file, etc.) and frequency of data exchange are expected between the new system and the Financial Management System (FMS) and LegalStratus? | Currently, there is no integration point to Legal Stratus. However, in the future there may be a need to build an interface to LegalStratus. The current integration method to FMS is via a flat file using SFTP. |
| 187 | Authentication Requirements for External Users: Will the agency require any specific third-party identity providers (e.g., NYC.ID, Login.gov) to be supported for external claimant authentication beyond self-registration and 2FA? | The proposer can recommend a solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP and used in similar implementations. |
| 188 | Azure Gov Cloud Compliance Requirements: Can the agency confirm if FedRAMP High compliance is required or preferred, and whether any NYC-specific cloud hosting policies supersede Microsoft's standard security baselines? | FedRAMP is not required but highly encouraged. Yes, NYC-specific cloud hosting policies supersede Microsoft's standard security baselines. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 189 | Real-Time Reporting and Data Warehouse Plans: Should Phase 1 include real-time reporting dashboards only, or are there expectations to deliver the initial framework of a data warehouse by go-live? | Please refer to Section III, Scope of Work and M/WBE Requirements to review what is to be delivered in Phase 1 and Phase 2. Key Deliverables section details that Data Warehouse Reporting Strategy is one of the key deliverables for Phase 1. Development of Data Warehouse Solution will be a critical part of the long-term solution, supporting advanced reporting and analytics once the Claims Processing Solution is live and stable at the completion of Phase 1. |
| 190 | Document Handling Volumes and Storage Needs: What is the anticipated volume of document uploads per claim, and are there any agency-imposed storage limits, file format constraints, or archival retention policies? | There are no agency-imposed storage limits. All types of documents formats (like PDF, word, excel etc.) must be supported. |
| 191 | System Access and User Roles: Can the agency provide estimated user counts and role types (claimant, examiner, supervisor, fiscal, legal), and clarify if any roles require workflow delegation or proxy access? | There are around 700 users in various roles. Some roles require workflow delegation/proxy access. Additional details will be discussed with the selected contractor after the contract award. |
| 192 | Legacy System Sunset Timeline: When is the expected decommissioning date for OAISIS, and will there be a required parallel run period between legacy and new systems? | This will be evaluated once we work on the timeline. |
| 193 | Change Management and Training Expectations: What level of training deliverables are expected from the vendor (e.g., instructor-led, e-learning, user manuals), and will agency staff be available for early user acceptance testing? | All modes of training are expected from the proposer. Yes, agency staff will be available for UAT. |
| 194 | Claims Lifecycle Flexibility: Will users be able to revise or reclassify a claim mid-process if new information arises, and should the system support backtracking or reopening previously closed steps? | Yes |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 195 | Communications Tracking: Should the system support outbound and inbound communication logs (email, phone, in-person) associated with each claim, and does this need to be reportable? | Yes |
| 196 | UAT and Pilot Expectations: What is the agency's preferred timeline and duration for user acceptance testing (UAT) and pilot launch prior to full system deployment? | This will be evaluated once we work on the timeline. |
| 197 | Go-Live and Transition Strategy: Does the agency envision a phased rollout by claim type, user group, or location—or is a single go-live date preferred across all users and workflows? | It is a single roll out for all claim types. |
| 198 | Letter Generation Requirements: Will the new system be expected to generate templated letters or notices (e.g., settlement offers, status updates), and if so, should this support dynamic content insertion? | Yes |
| 199 | Accessibility and Language Compliance: Are there any specific multilingual requirements for the public-facing portal, and should it comply with NYC language access laws or guidelines (e.g., top six languages)? | See refer to page 66, Exhibit C, Compliance 34. |
| 200 | Agency Involvement in Requirements Gathering: What level of engagement should be anticipated from agency SMEs during the discovery and requirements gathering phase (e.g., weekly workshops, ongoing reviews)? | SMEs within the Office of Comptroller will be involved as and when necessary, during discovery/requirement gathering phase but at this point, it is not anticipated for outside agencies to be involved in the development of the system needs. |
| 201 | Request for Extension: Given the complexity of scope and integration requirements, would the agency consider granting a two-week extension to ensure a fully compliant and high-quality proposal? | Please refer to Addendum 5. The proposal due date has been changed to June 17, 2025. |
| 202 | Are there any formatting requirements to the contract exceptions/redlines we can include with our response? | Please refer to the response in Question 8 above. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 203 | Will help desk services be required by the Comptroller's office? Or are there staff in place that will intake support requests? | Yes, Help Desk services will be required during the initial rollout. |
| 204 | Will the Contractor support services be primarily focused on supporting internal requests, or will there be a need for supporting external users as well? | All support requests to the contractor will be reviewed and routed by the Comptroller IT Helpdesk team. |
| 205 | Will support staff be required to be on site for the duration of the 5 years of required support services? | The Office will evaluate the support structure post contract award. |
| 206 | Will the City allow the use of third-party document management platforms (e.g., Box, SharePoint) with real-time APIs to the proposed platform, or does it require native document handling within the proposed platform? | There is no requirement restricting any third-party document management platforms. The proposer can recommend a solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP. |
| 207 | Is AI-based document classification (e.g., tagging, metadata extraction) expected at initial claim intake only, or throughout the case lifecycle? | It is anticipated that AI-based document classification should occur throughout the claim lifecycle. |
| 208 | Can the City confirm if real-time bi-directional integrations are required for all external systems listed in Exhibit D, or can batch/scheduled syncs be used for less time-sensitive systems? | Bi-directional integrations are required. Yes, Batch/Scheduled syncs can be used. |
| 209 | Are there defined service-level expectations for the integration layer API performance or retry handling for integrations with FMS and Legal Stratus? | Refer to the response for questions 186 above. |
| 210 | For interim dual-system operations, can data from OAISIS be exposed via read-only APIs or will flat file export/imports be required? | The Office does not expect dual-system operation. |
| 211 | Can you confirm if different workflows are expected per claim type (e.g., No-Fault vs. Real Property), or should we support a configurable case type model within a unified workflow engine? | The proposer can recommend a solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP and is used in similar implementations. The Office is open to both options. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 212 | Should reports requiring claim-level document metadata (e.g., number of documents uploaded per claim, document types) be sourced from the data warehouse or handled in the claims system? | Yes |
| 213 | Can the City confirm that all analytics and ad hoc dashboards will be internal-facing only? | There will be some external facing dashboards. |
| 214 | Does the City envision the proposed platform initiating payment vouchers directly, or is a middleware layer (e.g., the integration layer) required for all payment interactions with FMS? | The proposer can recommend a solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP. The Office is open to both options. |
| 215 | Are there standard forms or workflows required to process multi-party payments or lien verifications with HRA, DOF, or Medicare? | The current system queries HRA, DOF, Medicare outside systems on claims that have been settled to see if there are any outstanding liens associated with the claimant/plaintiff of the settled matter. We would want to have the new System to have the same ability to query these systems. Additionally, we also required to provide notification to the Attorney General's Office on certain settlements in order for the Attorney General's Office to conduct a Son of Sam check and as such, we would want a workflow created where that type of reporting to the Attorney General's Office on these settlements happens automatically and is tracked through the system. |
| 216 | Can the City confirm which agencies (e.g., HRA, DOF, Medicare) currently participate in lien recovery workflows, and whether others may be added in the future? | Those are the other agencies involved but we would also want to create a workflow or an integration/portal between our system and the Attorney General's Office on settlements which would fall within the purview of a Son of Sam Law check conducted by the Attorney General's office. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 217 | Is the system expected to perform real-time lien balance lookups at the time of payment processing, or is this a batch-based verification process? | This is a Batch based verification process. |
| 218 | Will the City provide documentation or APIs for calculating the specific deduction amounts for each lien type (e.g., child support, Medicare reimbursements, parking fines)? | Deductions are based on the lien information. Contractor is expected to work with Agencies to build interfaces to get the lien information for lien calculation and payments. |
| 219 | Should the system generate a standardized 'Claim Breakout' report to show gross settlement, lien deductions, and net payment? If so, are there formatting or compliance guidelines for this document? | There is no requirement for a system generated Claim Breakout Report. The Office is open to all suggestions. The proposer can recommend a solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP. |
| 220 | Are there existing approval workflows when a lien match is returned (e.g., legal review, manual override, or appeal process) before the payment is finalized? | Yes |
| 221 | Can the system notify claimants about pending or confirmed lien deductions before the final settlement is issued, or should this be visible only post-payment? | The ability for the new system to notify claimants/outside counsel about outstanding liens before payment should be available. |
| 222 | If a claimant or payee does not yet have a vendor number in FMS, is the proposed system expected to trigger the vendor request process automatically? Are there SLAs for vendor creation? | Currently Vendor ID creation is performed by comptroller personnel. However, the proposer can recommend a solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP and used in similar implementations. |
| 223 | Can multiple lien payments be routed to different payees from a single settlement voucher, or must separate vouchers be created for each payee? | Separate Vouchers need to be created for each Payee. |
| 224 | Are there edge cases or exceptions (e.g., settlement caps, disputed liens, over-deductions) that require special business rules or manual handling in the payment process? | Yes |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 225 | Can you confirm whether you would like to ingest all parts of a claim, including from third-party connected systems, into the data warehouse as new data relevant to a claim gets created through additional processes throughout the life of the claim's processing and disposition? Or will only certain parts of the claim, or a subset of claims data need to be ingested into the data warehouse? (Example Data Modules: Liens, Payments, Settlements, Claim Party Members (Lawyer, Claimants), Activity History (Emails, Tasks), Document Checklist Details) | Yes, the office expects the new system to ingest all parts of a claim including from third-party connections systems into data warehouse. |
| 226 | How are third parties granted access to a claim? How can a claimant authorize a third party (like an insurer) to their claim(s). Will external user access always require authentication, or can it be anonymous (e.g., check claim status without login)? | All external user access will require Authentication. Third party access to claim will require authorization and authentication by the Office of the Comptroller. For a Claimant, it will be anticipated for the claimant to receive access to the documents filed by the claimant, the claim status etc. via a portal into the system. This access will only occur with some type of security protocol which only allows the claimant access to their claim(s) the claimant has filed. |
| 227 | Do third parties need portal login to handle multiple claims from different parties | Third parties who are provided with access to the Claim System are provided with a specific "basket" assigned to this third party which only allows this specific Third Party to have access to their claims. For example, the Department of Sanitation can only see Notice of Claims that have the Department of Sanitation as the agency involved in the claim. |
| 228 | Do different levels permission, access, editability rights of third parties need to be supported | If Third Parties refer to Insurers/Attorney's, the yes. |
| 229 | Are there data quality issues in the existing system (OAISIS) that the | No data quality issues identified at this moment. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | vendor should be aware of before migration? | |
| 230 | Do you have a standard DevOps process across technologies? Do you have a team of IT members focused on DevOps? Should we assume, we will manage all DevOps and use our standards? | We expect the proposer to provide the DevOps support. |
| 231 | Will the system need to log interactions and events (security, access, etc.) in a centralized system outside of the Claims System? | There is no requirement to log interactions in a centralized system outside of the Claims system. However, the proposer can recommend a solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP and used in similar implementations. |
| 232 | Can you confirm if there are any current restrictions or preferences regarding cloud-based integration platforms (e.g., MuleSoft Anypoint Platform)? | There is no preference. |
| 233 | Do you require on-premise deployment or would hybrid/multi-cloud integration deployment models be acceptable? | Please refer to Section II Project Background and Goals, C Project Overview and Goals on Page 5. |
| 234 | Steps 9 and 10 reference the "Law Department" logs onto the system to make updates. Are the "Law Department" users part of the Office of Law and Adjustment? If no, how many users in the Law Department will need access to the new system? | The Law Department is not part of the Office of Comptroller and specifically, the Bureau of Law and Adjustment which is part of the Office of Comptroller. The NYC Law Department is a separate Mayoral Agency and they are tasked to handle all the litigation filed against the City of New York. Aside from specific types of litigation depending on jurisdiction, most litigation handled by the Law Department arises out of claims filed with the Office of Comptroller but do not get resolved in the pre-litigation stage. If the claim does not get resolved during pre-litigation, the claimant has the option to pursue their claim through litigation which is then handled by the NYC Law Department. The NYC Law Department is provided access to the |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | underlying claims that gave rise to the litigation and as such, the NYC Law Department attorneys and staff will review the claim file. Ideally, the number of users for the NYC Law Department will be significant (say, 1000 employees) but that the number of actually users is dependent on how the NYC Law Department wants its staff to operate. |
| 235 | Do you anticipate receiving claims in flat files / CSV from parties that need to be ingested into claims processing system? If yes, what all claims types might require this mode of intake. | No, we don't anticipate new claims being submitted in flat file/CSV format. |
| 236 | Can you confirm that for any system / agency / 3rd party that needs to be integrated with new claims processing system, you will arrange dedicated time for the SMEs (technical and business) of those areas to support the concerned activities throughout the engagement? Also, can you confirm that any changes needed on those systems for newly created integrations would be owned by those parties? These changes would include making any interface / file / connection available for consumption or consuming any interface / data exposed through the middleware. | SMEs will be involved as and when necessary, during discovery/requirement gathering phase. Existing integration will need to be consumed as is by the application. Additional integrational points will be determined during the requirement gathering phase. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 237 | For Section 1.2.1.2 Financial Capacity, may bidders submit their financial statement in a separate email? To ensure the confidentiality of this sensitive information, we request that a designated representative send the financials directly to the City, separately from the proposal. | No. Please refer to Section IV. Proposal Format and Requirements. |
| 238 | For Section 1.2.1.2 Financial Capacity, is it sufficient for bidders to provide their most recent audited financial statement? How many statements are required? | Please refer to Section IV, B Proposal Format, 1.2.1.2 Financial Capacity. |
| 239 | For Section 1.2.1.2 Financial Capacity, will the City accept an attestation from the CFO, a D&B report, or other alternative documentation in lieu of the financial statements? | Proposal information is only shared with the proposal evaluation committee. |
| 240 | For Section 1.2.1.2 Financial Capacity, will the City keep financial information strictly confidential? | Proposal information is only shared with the proposal evaluation committee. |
| 241 | We are unable to add a signature in the Certification box at the bottom of Attachment F_Doing-Business-Data-Form-Standard-2018. We receive an error that states, "The author of this form has specified which fields you can fill." Can the City please provide a copy of the form that allows a signature to be added? | Please download the form at the link: https://comptroller.nyc.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Doing-Business-Data-Form-Standard-2018.pdf |
| 242 | Are bidders required to provide Appendix A Certificates of Insurance with the proposal? If so, which package (i.e., Document 1: Technical Proposal; Document 2: Price Proposal; Document 3: MWBE Schedule; or Document 4: Doing Business Data Form) should bidders include the certificates of insurance in? | No, insurance is not required at the time of the proposal due date. |
| 243 | What are the different file types included that comprise over 13 TB Unstructured Data? | Please refer to question 46 in Addendum 1. |
| 244 | How many such files are there? | Please refer to question 46 in Addendum 1. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 245 | In addition to the file name, type, size, datetime, etc., what other Metadata fields associated with each file are available? For example: Claim ID, Claim Date, Account and Customer Identifiers, Type of document, Location, various dates. | Yes, additional metadata is available. |
| 246 | Are the above documents accessed only from the respective case / claim records? Or is there a need to access it through a general search query? | The Claim records can be accessed through search query within the claim application (restrictions apply). |
| 247 | Could you share volumetric details of the structured data? Please specify Size in GB, Number of Tables, Number of records in the high-volume tables, Average record size in Bytes. | Please refer to Question 12 in Addendum 1. |
| 248 | Data Standardization Templates: Are there Comptroller-defined data templates or standards (e.g., for claim intake or resolution reporting) that must be enforced across workflows and document types? | Yes |
| 249 | Integration Middleware Preferences: Are there preferred tools (e.g., MuleSoft, Azure Integration Services) or architectural constraints for integrating with FMS, Legal Stratus, or other listed systems? | Currently, SFTP is the integration method. Other tools can be explored during implementation phase |
| 250 | Document Tagging & Search: Are there specific metadata tagging schemas or search filters required for document storage and retrieval across the claims lifecycle? | There are no specific Tagging and Search requirements. The proposer can recommend a search solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP. |
| 251 | OCR Scope: Does the City require OCR (Optical Character Recognition) capabilities for existing archived PDFs/scanned documents, or only for newly submitted files? | It is not necessarily a requirement for OCR archived material, but it would be helpful if the new system could have that feature. |
| 252 | Internal Staffing Support: Could the Comptroller's Office clarify the expected availability and expertise level of internal IT resources (e.g., DBAs, sysadmins, testers) during implementation and post-go-live support? | The Internal Staff will be available for support as and when necessary. Duties and responsibilities will be discussed with the selected contractor after the contract award. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 253 | Workflow Automation Scenarios: Are there specific automation expectations (e.g., deadline escalations, time-based alerts, or audit review workflows) not explicitly listed in the RFP? | Yes, the office expects workflow automation. The scenarios will be discussed during detailed requirement analysis phase of the project. |
| 254 | Form Customization Examples: Are there specific intake or evaluation forms that include logic-heavy rules, conditional visibility, or nested fields that proposers should plan for? | Yes, there will be logic built into the intake claim forms. |
| 255 | Audit Report Compliance: Will the Comptroller accept a recent SOC 2 Type II audit report covering the applicable scope areas (security, availability, processing integrity, confidentiality, and privacy), in alignment with Appendix G? | No. The Office will conduct a security assessment (SSAP) during our cloud review process in addition to reviewing the Compliance reports. |
| 256 | PCI-DSS Applicability: Will the solution be required to handle payment or financial data directly (e.g., claimant disbursements), and thus require PCI-DSS compliance? | No |
| 257 | Relevant Experience Flexibility: Egen has successfully delivered Salesforce and Google Cloud–based solutions for public sector clients involving large-scale digital transformation, and constituent engagement platforms. These projects required complex workflow automation, secure integrations, and strict compliance alignment. Would experience of this nature—despite not being in direct claims modernization—be acceptable if the scale, user base, and process complexity align with the needs of this RFP? | The Office will consider all proposals that can meet the requirements outlined in the solicitation. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 258 | Reference Relevance: For the required 5 references, would the Comptroller's Office consider examples of similar enterprise-grade public sector implementations—such as digital transformations—if they demonstrate comparable scope, user volume, and system interoperability to the proposed Claims Processing Solution? | The Office will consider all proposals that can meet the requirements outlined in the solicitation. |
| 259 | Support Model Expectations: Is the Comptroller's Office expecting a dedicated post-go-live support contact, or is an SLA-based helpdesk with escalation procedures sufficient? | This is dependent on the solution selected, but we expect a dedicated post-go-live support at least during the initial rollout. |
| 260 | Training Format Preferences: What is the expected training model (e.g., live, train-the-trainer, self-paced), and approximately how many internal users will require each type? | Please refer to response for Question 108 above. |
| 261 | Enhancements vs. Maintenance: Should system enhancements (e.g., new workflows, major feature additions) be scoped into the maintenance agreement or treated as separate change orders? | This depends on the solution selected and the lower cost option will be prioritized. |
| 262 | Will OAISIS and the new Claims Processing Solution operate in parallel for any duration? If yes, for how long? | OAISIS contains other modules that will not be sunseted with the Claims processing solution. The Claims module will continue to run until BLA decides it is ready to swap over. |
| 263 | Has the Comptroller's Office completed any data discovery or schema mapping from OAISIS to assist with migration, or should we anticipate starting from scratch? | The Office will provide current data structure, schema, Data dictionary and the ER diagrams. Contractor is expected to perform the schema mapping from OAISIS to the New system. |
| 264 | Does the Comptroller's Office have any preferences regarding cloud? E.g.: Google, Salesforce, AWS, etc.. | No |
| 265 | Can you please consider providing a 2 week extension for RFP submission? | Please refer to Addendum 5. The proposal due date has been changed to June 17, 2025. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 266 | As we review the RFP and assess potential solutions that align with your requirements, I wanted to clarify your position on the stated need for a solution hosted on FedRAMP certified environment. Specifically, would your team be open to considering a platform such as OutSystems – a leader in low-code development, which—while not currently FedRAMP certified—offers robust security and compliance features aligned with industry best practices? OutSystems holds certifications for GDPR, HIPAA, ISO 27001, and SOC 2, and is a member of both the Cloud Security Alliance (CSA) and the Center for Internet Security (CIS). In addition, it offers a self-hosted and self-managed deployment option, which can be run within your agency's or OTI's datacenter, potentially providing enhanced control and compliance alignment.<br>We believe OutSystems can deliver significant value for this initiative and would appreciate your guidance on whether such a solution would be considered acceptable under the current RFP guidelines. Looking forward to your insights. | FEDRAMP solution is preferred but not required. |
| 267 | Does the City want an existing "out-of-the-box" claims processing solution, or would it consider a custom low code development/implementation of the solution? | The Office is open on the solution to the RFP. |
| 268 | Can you please provide the requirements for the functional and scaled demonstration in evaluation round 2? | Please refer to question 2 in Addendum 2. |
| 269 | How do you currently Identify duplicate claims? is there any business rules defined for detecting the duplicate claims? (like matching claim number, policy number, insured details, claim details, claim amount etc.) | Currently, the Office identifies duplicate claims based on claimant information, occurrence information. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 270 | What is the process followed during Investigation and evaluation? (We understand that an examiner can gather requirement documents, analyze them, set up meetings with the parties involved, or visit the physical site for evaluation. However, would you benefit from automating the comparison of information across documents, checking the eligibility criteria based on business rules from the information extracted from the collected documents, etc.?) | The Office is open to a system being able to provide a function like comparing a certain type of document received (medical record, 50-h transcript, occurrence report etc.) within multiple claims. Since we do not have the current ability to create business rules like that suggested in the question, we cannot assess the usefulness of a specific business rule like the one suggested in the question. However, the ability to create business rules like the one suggested could be an important feature to have in a new claim system. |
| 271 | Are you looking for searching the document based on the semantic search based on the document content meaning or are you looking for key word based search like case number, policy number, claimant name etc. | Yes |
| 272 | When the beneficiary uploads documents, do you prefer to ask them to upload individual documents and tag their names? Or would you prefer an approach where users can upload single or multiple files in a single document, and we automatically split, classify, and check if all the required documents are submitted? If any documents are missing, we would trigger a notification | It is important for any documents that are being uploaded by the claimant for the claimant to designate the type of document that is being uploaded. Unfortunately, sometimes a document uploaded could be a bulk document and thus, it would be important for an examiner to separate the document based on the type of document uploaded. Additionally, the Office has to have proper vetting on the document/file that is being uploaded - is it proper? virus? |
| 273 | What is the volume of documents that needs to be processed to perform classification and extraction? (daily/weekly/monthly) | Please refer to question 11 in Addendum 1. |
| 274 | What would be the required file type of the documents that need to be processed? (like PDF, DOCX, JPEG, etc.) | Please refer to question 46 in Addendum 1. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 275 | What are the languages of the documents that the system should support for document processing? (Is it the same as the list of languages that should be supported by website? If No, please list the languages required for document processing) | Please refer to question 9 in Addendum 2. |
| 276 | What's the text format within the documents (handwritten/scanned)? | Both |
| 277 | What is the maximum number of pages in document? | There is currently no limit. The Office has documents over 700 pages. |
| 278 | List out all the document types, such as Claims Form, SSN, Rental Agreement, Driving License, Passport, Vehicle Registration, Medical bills, etc. that needs to be processed | In reference to this question and the examples, there is no specific list of document type. |
| 279 | Are there any requirements to process data formats beyond text documents, such as video or audio? If so, could you describe a specific use case for each format, including how it would be integrated into the project? | Please refer to question 46 in Addendum 1. |
| 280 | Describe the complete data flow for document processing, including where documents come from, how they are received and where the final output should be integrated with? Are there any existing systems or databases that need to be connected for matching or verifying information? | All Claims/documents are received via paper or electronically. Once the claims/documents are validated and processed, they are routed to Law and Adjustment team via workflows. Please refer to Exhibit B and Exhibit D of the RFP. |
| 281 | Please provide a brief of the current estate. Are you using on-prem or any cloud provider (AWS / Azure / GCP)? | OAISIS is an on-prem form-based enterprise application. Currently, the Office does not have any cloud-based applications. |
| 282 | Is the GCP Organization node and Billing Account setup? | No, GCP cloud account does not exist. |
| 283 | What is the current setup for Identity (G Suite, Azure AD, PingID, Okta etc.)? Is SSO or MFA (Multi-factor authentication) required? If so, what is the tool?/what is the provider? | SSO and MFA are required. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 284 | Would you like to integrate the same Identity platform with GCP? | The proposer can recommend a solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP and used in similar implementations. |
| 285 | Is there a requirement of connecting the current environment (on-prem, AWS, Azure) with GCP? If yes, What's the preference between VPN / Interconnect? | This depends on the proposed solution cutover/ coexistence plans. Once the new solution is in place, the existing claims application will be decommissioned. VPN is preferred. |
| 286 | Which Compliance or regulations would you like to apply on GCP Environment? (e.g. HIPAA, CCPA, GDPR, SOC2, ISO etc.). Request you to please share the checklist with us. | The RFP sets forth the compliance standards required by the New York City Office of Technology and Information ("OTI"), the City's Chief Privacy officer, and contemplated by the Comptroller's Office:<br>Exhibit C – Non Functional Requirements<br>Appendix D, the Cloud Agreement<br>Appendix E, Privacy Protection Rider<br>Appendix F, Identifying Information Rider<br>Appendix G, Security Requirements (see hyperlink included in the document Cybersecurity Requirements for Vendors & Contractors - NYC Office of Technology and Innovation - OTI)<br>Appendix E, Software End-User License Agreement ("EULA")<br><br>The selected contactor shall perform all services in the agreement in accordance with all applicable Laws as are in effect at the time such services are performed. |
| 287 | Is there a requirement to integrate any 3rd party tools for Logging & Monitoring, Security etc.? (E.g. Datadog, NewRelic, Splunk, PagerDuty etc.) | There is no requirement to integrate with any 3rd party tool. However, Proposer can recommend a solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP and used in similar implementations. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 288 | Do you need a CI/CD based deployment model for your GCP Environment? If so, what is the preferred/current tool set? (Jenkins, Github Actions)? | The proposer can recommend a solution that best aligns with the requirements defined in the RFP and used in similar implementations. |
| 289 | Can you walk us through a User Journey to understand end to end user persona? (E.g. Attorneys, claim professional, admin staff) | Please refer to Exhibit B Functional Requirements: Claim Journey Maps of the RFP. |
| 290 | What user roles will the system support (e.g., attorneys, claims professionals, administrative staff)? | The system should support all roles. |
| 291 | What specific functionalities should be restricted to specific user roles (e.g., access to claim details, approval workflows)? | The system should have the capability to allow management to restrict access to certain claim files or documents within a claim file based on a person's level or role. The limitation is based on sensitivity of the matter, privileged documents, or the claim file and/or documents in a file are only specific to certain agency/law firm. |
| 292 | How should the application handle the different stages of the claims process (Intake, Assign, Investigate, Make Offer, Settlement Authorization, Initiating Payment)? | The application should be intuitive in which the claim status should be trigged by the event of the claim process. For example, intake will be dictated by claim filing or initiating payment process will occur once the General Release or Closing Papers are received and uploaded to the system. |
| 293 | Are there any automation requirements for processing claims (e.g., auto-assigning cases, auto-generating settlement offers)? | Yes. The Office expects the new system to auto-assign claims. We expect a new system to provide automation wherever possible during the life cycle of a claim. Automation points can be discussed during discovery/requirement phase of the project. |
| 294 | What existing internal and external systems does the new claims processing solution need to integrate with (e.g., financial systems, case management tools, document management systems)? | Please refer to Exhibit D of RFP. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 295 | What integration protocols or standards are required (e.g., REST APIs, SOAP, file-based integration)? | Currently, the integration points are file based. However, we expect the new system to provide other integration protocols/standards (REST API, SOAP, etc.) wherever possible. |
| 296 | Will the system need to exchange data with external entities, and what data formats (e.g., XML, JSON) are expected? | There is no explicit requirement on data formats. However, the new system should support XML and JSON. |
| 297 | What is the underlying database/data warehouse that is being leveraged by OAISIS currently | Oracle |
| 298 | List down the Data Sources from where the data is captured? (List both batch and real-time sources, in case) | Please refer to Exhibit D of RFP. |
| 299 | What are the current ETL tools being used? Do you want to refactor or continue using the same? | There are currently no ETL tools being used. |
| 300 | What percentage of the data is structured, semi-structured, unstructured? | Please refer to Question 12 in Addendum 1. |
| 301 | Provide a breakdown of this data volume based on different data types or categories (e.g., transactional data, historical data, logs, etc.). | Please refer to Question 12 in Addendum 1. |
| 302 | Are there an existing data models that can be leveraged or do we have to design new data models? | The Office expects the proposer to design a new data model. |
| 303 | Total Number of ETL Jobs by other ETL tools<br>(broken down by complexity: simple, medium, complex, very complex) | There are currently no ETL tools being used. |
| 304 | What tool are you using for Orchestration of jobs, Total Number of Orchestrated/Scheduled Jobs<br>(broken down by complexity: simple, medium, complex, very complex) | There are currently no ETL tools being used. |
| 305 | What is the typical read/write ratio of your database workloads? (e.g., 80% reads / 20% writes) | Refer to Question 38 of Addendum 2. |
| 306 | What types of data and formats will we handle? | There are currently no ETL tools being used. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 307 | Are you currently using any BI tools for analysis? If yes, How many reports & dashboards are currently live? | The Office currently has Power BI for data analysis. There are around 20-30 dashboard/reports on Power BI and 20-30 Automated reports. |
| 308 | Do you need the dashboards to re-pointed to different data sources or create new dashboards | Yes, dashboards would be an excellent function to have. |

THE REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

**REVISED ATTACHMENT C**
**PRICE PROPOSAL FORM**

**Instructions:** Proposers must provide fixed pricing for Parts 1-4 based on the five-year contract term. Additional pricing not covered by Parts 1-3 must be detailed in Part 4. The sum of Parts 1-5 shall be the price proposal and will be used to calculate the Price Proposal Score as detailed in Section V of the RFP. Proposers are encouraged to provide a detailed breakdown for Parts 1-4 as supporting documentation. However, this Attachment C must be included in the proposal submission.

| | | Description | Fixed Price Proposed |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Part 1** | **Implementation** | The Proposer must include a proposed fixed price per milestone, deliverable, or component/module. | |
| **Part 2** | **Licensing** | Provide a detailed list of all licensing costs associated with scope of work outlined in Sections II and III of the RFP, including, but not limited to:<br>a. Claims Solution<br>b. Data Warehouse Solution<br>c. other third-party licenses (if applicable)<br><br>Include any additional assumptions/details for licensing costs (i.e.: recurring or one-time charge) | |
| **Part 3** | **Maintenance Services** | Provide the total cost of maintenance services. | |
| **Part 4** | **Additional Charges** | Provide a detailed listing of fixed pricing not captured by Parts 1-3 above. | |
| | | **TOTAL FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL** | $ 0.00 |