DAVID A. PATERSON
GOVERNOR

ROBERT E. BELOTEN
CHAIR

November 12, 2010

Dear Contractor:

The New York State Workers' Compensation Board (WCB or Board) issued a   Request for Information (RFI) to solicit information from interested parties ("Respondents") regarding a variety of topics related to business process reengineering, formal requirements gathering and system evaluation.

The Board received the following questions in response to the RFI. The purpose of this letter is to respond in writing to these questions, so that all potential Respondents may benefit from the response.

Q1: Can you advise the current "as is" platform of the system? We are specialized to a particular platform and this information will determine if we are qualified to participate in the RFI.
A1: This RFI is not intended to address the specific architecture of a replacement system, but is instead looking to focus on conducting formal requirements gathering and a thorough Business Process reengineering exercise to address the evolving role of the WCB and to meet the emerging needs of the WCB. The WCB expects to evaluate not only the internal operational requirements of the WCB, but the business requirements of system stakeholders and most importantly, the service requirements, without restricting the reengineering activities by constraining the delivery methodology or architecture.

Q2: It mentions in the Project Overview section that this is the first phase in an envisioned multi-phased project. Is there an estimate as to how many phases there will be and any details for each phase?
A2: The first phase is the RFI phase, the second phase will be a RFP to contract with a vendor to perform the formal requirements gathering and business process reengineering, the third phase will likely be at least one RFP to contract with a vendor to develop or deploy a new claims management system or a significant component of a new system. The fourth phase will likely be the awarding of contracts and the implementation of a new claims management system for New York's workers' compensation system.

Q3: Will there be more RFPs released for this project? If so, are there any details on the services they may cover?
A3: Yes. As stated in answers to Q1 and Q2, the first phase is the RFI phase, the second phase will be the release of an RFP to contract with a vendor to perform the formal requirements gathering and business process reengineering. It is anticipated that one or more RFP will be required to contract with vendor(s) to develop or deliver the necessary components of the new claims management system. Details about the third phase RFP(s) will be determined as a result of the RFI process.

Q4: Can we obtain a list of parties expressing interest in this RFI? Our experience is that teaming arrangements often provide the best overall solution for projects like this and will there be any M/WBE contract requirements on future RFP's.
A4: Yes, please see attachment. This information is also available on the WCB's website.

Q5: Will the selected vendor for the Case Management Systems Redesign RFI be precluded from participating in the delivery of the recommended system redesign?
I'm wondering from the perspective of the software technology and the services needed to implement the software according to the recommendation?
Would the vendor be precluded as both a prime and as a sub?
A5: Yes, NYS Procurement Law precludes a vendor from bidding on both the RFP for the development of the system requirements and the RFP for the system implementation, as either a prime or a sub.

Q6: Am I correct in assuming that the term "participant" refers to those who will be designated to speak on behalf of vendor?
A6: Yes, this is a correct assumption.

Q7: Can I assume that we'll be permitted to have "observers" present as well?
A7: Yes, observers will be allowed.

Q8: Is there a limit on the number of "presenters"?

A8: The WCB is requesting that vendors limit the number of presenters/participants to no more than 4 per vendor. All Respondents and/or Presenters must submit a list of attendees, including name, title and contact information via e-mail to: WCBcontracts@wcb.state.ny.us or michelle.schultz@wcb.state.ny.us by December 1, 2010.

Q9: Assuming that they will be accommodated, is there a limit on the number of "observers"?
A9: The WCB is requesting that vendors limit the number of presenters/participants to no more than 4 per vendor.

Q10: Is it possible to get a list of those that have expressed interest? This is a large project and some partnering may be involved.
A10: Please see response to Q4.

Q11: Do you have any enterprise architecture program to support the Claim Management System redesign system effort?
A11: Please see response to Q1.

Q12: Are current claim management processes and workflows are documented?
A12: Many of the WCB's internal processes and workflows are documented but the Board has little formal documentation of the system stakeholder processes.

Q13: Why are you interested in going for a lengthy business process re-engineering effort?
A13: There are many participants in New York's workers' compensation system. There is no single "customer" group from whom requirements could be gathered. Code-on-the-fly methods do not provide the appropriate communication tools required for the WCB to ensure that disparate stakeholder groups understand the envisioned system and for the WCB to obtain the support and approvals to proceed before components are constructed.

Q14: Section 2.12 Technology – Electronic Data Interchange Would the New York State WCB consider treating EDI as an individual project with a dedicated budget & timeline?
A14: Yes, but the WCB believes that EDI needs to be considered as part of an overall business process reengineering strategy from the perspective of the development of new requirements and business processes. Once a determination has been made of what may/may not be done with EDI, WCB will consider whether it should be treated as an individual project or be contained within the larger implementation.

Q15: Section 2.12 Technology – Electronic Data Interchange Has New York begun the process of reviewing data requirements for EDI? (i.e. comparison of current forms vs. desired electronic elements)
A15: Yes, the WCB has begun the process of reviewing requirements for EDI.

Q16: Section 2.13 Technology – The Internet With the understanding that Analytics provide benefit to both the WCB, and the WCB's carrier trading partners, will the WCB grant the successful bidder the opportunity to deliver ancillary data products to the WCB trading partners via the internet?
(All such offerings would be composed of unidentifiable, anonymized data, except for the authorized trading partner viewing their own data. For example, benchmarking and compliance products and services designed for the carrier community as a way to measure their performance within the state.)
A16: Please refer to Q1, Q2 and Q3. Insofar as "best practices" research informs an envisioning and requirements gathering undertaking, the WCB may allow the successful bidder the opportunity to deliver supporting data products. As the underlying details of this question may require a legal determination and policy assessment, the WCB cannot answer this question at this time.

Q17: Section 2.14 Performance Measures Question -While the focus of this RFI appears to be claims, should the responding vendor be prepared to propose performance measurements on Policy, Claims and Medical data, or just claims?
A17: The WCB anticipates that the development of system performance measures will be a component of this project. Gathering the requirements for measuring the entirety of the workers' compensation system will be in scope.

Q18: Section 2.14 Performance Measures Question -While the focus of this RFI appears If the WCB were to purchase access to an analytical front end, of the 1,500 WCB employees, how many users would NYWCB anticipate?
A18: Please see responses to Q1, Q2 and Q3.

Q19: Is there a limit on the number of participants that a vendor can bring, for the purpose of presenting?
A19: Please see response to Q8.

Q20: Outside of participants, who may present, is there a limit on the number of participants that a vendor may bring for the purpose of observing the Conference?
A20: Please see response to Q9.

Q21: Can you provide vendors with an understanding of the format for the Pre-Proposal Conference?
A21: The one-day vendor roundtable to be held before responses to the RFI are due will include presentations from the WCB on New York's workers' compensation system. It will include an opportunity for vendors to ask clarifying questions about the initial RFP and the project's overall approach.

Q22: What performance measures do you currently use to manage your processes?
A22: The WCB measures internal processes by addressing the efficiency, effectiveness, timeliness and quality of the process while ensuring that the outcomes produced are the desired outcomes. There are hundreds of performance measures within a hierarchical structure of reporting from a "dashboard" to "process" to "activity" perspectives. The WCB currently only measures external stakeholder performance on an ad hoc basis in support of addressing specific policy questions as they arise.

Q23: Are there any existing business process documents that you would seek to incorporate into this process, or should all documentation be newly created?
A23: While some existing business process documents may be incorporated into this process, the expectation is that newly created documents will be required.

Q24: When would you envision this initial project phase to begin?
A24: At the conclusion of the RFI, the WCB anticipates it will take 4-8 months to develop and release the RFP.

Q25: What WCB resources will be available to continue to the project? Will the WCB provide any dedicated resources to this project? Will stakeholders be available for requirements gathering sessions?

A25: Yes, the WCB expects to make dedicated and part-time resources available to this project. The WCB hopes to learn from the vendor community about internal resource deployment seen as required to support this project. Yes, we anticipate that stakeholders will be available for requirements gathering sessions.

Q26: Is the overall project (BPR and resulting WCB Redesign) budgeted? If not, do you anticipate funding in a specific period or year?

A26: Current economic circumstances are especially challenging. Nonetheless, at this time funding to conduct the requirements gathering phase is budgeted.

Q27: What is the technical platform of the WCB's IC-2 System? How large is this database?

A27: Please see response to Q1.

Q28: Office of Operations (11 offices and 30 customer service centers). What is the average number of employees at each office and at each customer service center?

A28: The size of WCB district offices and service centers varies.

Q29: How large is the Claims Information System PowerBuilder database? Is this one instance, or multiple?

A29: Please see response to Q1.

Q30: Should we consider all the functional areas under Appendix A as being within scope for BPR? Is the WBC willing to entertain a phased-approach? If so, which groups would be in the first phase?

A30: Yes, all functional areas described under Appendix A are involved with claims management are in scope. The WCB would entertain a phased-approach to envisioning and requirements gathering.

Q31: On page 12 Section 3.10 - Does the state prefer one electronic original copy, or multiple copies?

A31: The WCB prefers one electronic copy of RFI responses.

Q32: On Page 8 Section 2.7 - In the Resources and Timelines section the state references a Target Environment Report. What is the nature of this report?

A32: The Target Environment Report is a narrative document that describes the envisioned system. The Target Environment Report would also likely include graphical representations of the business processes and be a companion document to formal requirements documentation.

Q33: If a vendor is selected for the BPR phase of the project, can the vendor participate in the subsequent RFP for the system implementation, resulting from this phase of BPR?

A33: Please see response to Q5.

Q34: Section 3.10 - Is there any restriction on number of client references?
A34: No.

Q35: Is there any anticipated timeline for completing the BPR phase?
A35: The WCB expects to complete requirements gathering and the release of a Target Environment Report and supporting requirements documents within 12-18 months of the start of the requirements gathering.

Q36: What are the current technology areas that WCB may wish to retain and re-use?
A36: Please see response to Q1.

Q37: For Section 2.6 page 7 of the RFI: Is the NYS WCB intending to extend this contract for ongoing change management activities (Communication and Stakeholder Participation) during new system development and implementation?
A37: The WCB understands the value of continuity between phases. Depending on what the WCB learns from the vendor community about their experiences with the transition from the requirements gathering phase, the RFP may include services for post-requirements gathering support.

Q38: For Section 1 pages 3- 4 of the RFI: Does the NYS WCB plan on releasing a separate RFP for QA/IV&V services over the implementation?
A38: No decision has been made with respect to QA/IV&V.

Q39: For Section 2.6 page 7 of the RFI: What is the process that NYS WCB envisages for Stakeholder participation (non WCB staff participation) in the BPR project?
A39: The WCB expects to learn from the vendor community the types of stakeholder interactions found to be most efficient and effective.

Q40: For Appendix A pages 14-19: To what degree are current NYS WCB core business procedures standardized across the 11 District Offices and the 30 Customer Service Centers? What is the extent of current documentation of the core business processes?
A40: While many of the core business procedures are standardized across the state, the WCB recognizes regional influences on statewide standard procedures.

Q41: For Section 1 page 4 of the RFI: Can NYS WCB provide copies of the Workers' Compensation Reform Task Force reports including the Data Collection Committee report from 2007?
A41: These reports are available from the WCB website.

Q42: For Section 1 thru 2, pages 3-5: Does WCB have current detailed system documentation on all the impacted business process?
A42: The WCB does not have current detailed system documentation on all impacted business processes.

Q43: The size and scale of the New York State WC system makes it part of unique club of large workers compensation jurisdictions such as California and Pennsylvania – does

the scope of the RFI include a plan to understand the budget, scope, business process, timeline, lessons learned, etc. to be incorporated from such States in the requirements for the New York State System Implementation RFP?

A43: Yes. The WCB recognizes the value of "best practices" research as well as the opportunities to learn from challenges faced in other jurisdictions.

Q44: It has been our experience that individual offices in large jurisdictions such as New York State tend to have disparate processes that have developed over time. How does the WCB plan to engage internal staff (Clerical, Judges, etc.) across different office sizes and representing different processes? Have such staff and offices been identified and will they be made available for a period of time during the project?

> a. Are there, for example, differences in the process for scheduling hearings across offices, differences in the templates used for judges' orders and decisions, etc.?
> b. Have such staff and offices been identified and will they be made available for a period of time during the project?

A44: For more than a decade, the WCB has had an Office of Continuous Improvement and a business process management methodology to address regional influences on statewide procedures.

Q45: For WCBs embarking on designing new processes and systems, it is important that input from external stakeholders, big and small, as well as those of the injured worker are incorporated during the requirements gathering and business redesign process. What methods has the WCB used in the past to engage such groups? Additionally, does the WCB already have in place an external stakeholder advisory group of sorts that can be utilized during the project?

A45: The WCB has used a variety of methods including conferences, round-tables, education seminars, webinars, one-on-one meetings, meetings with professional organizations representing stakeholders, emails, bulletins and formal policy pronouncements.

Q46: While we understand that the WCB cannot anticipate whether the technology implementation will be a "buy" or a "build" or some combination, we would like to understand the experience the WCB has had in implementing its systems in the past and whether they have been "buy" or "build." Can any experiences or perspectives be shared?

A46: The WCB has experience with deploying Commercial Off The Shelf Solutions (COTS) as-is, deploying COTS with customizations and building systems internally.

Q47: Based on our experience in other states, electronic bulk filing should be a key component for large external stakeholder groups (e.g. lien claimants, law firms, medical providers, etc.). Is bulk filing a consideration for common forms such as Application for Board Review, Employer's Report of Work-Related Injury/Illness, Doctor's Initial Report, etc)?

A47: It is difficult to imagine the envisioned system not including expanded EDI between the WCB and system participants.

Q48: Is there an automated service in place today to process liens (e.g. a service used to file liens, receive case information, etc). If so, how do you envision this process changing in the future?
A48: As this is a term-of-art used in some jurisdictions but not widely used in claims handing in New York we are unable to answer this question.

Q49: What business processes/access is envisioned for external customers (e.g. file a claim, schedule a hearing, etc)?
a. What types of external customers do you anticipate granting access to (e.g. injured workers, employers, TPA, etc? Based on the external customer access, have you considered how external user accounts will be created and managed? For example, how would the employer or TPA get an account created, and how would those users be managed?
A49: We expect all system participants to be a part of the requirements gathering phase. We expect all system participants needs for interacting with the WCB to be reflected in the requirements that are gathered.

Q50: Metrics are important and can be captured/measured in different ways. Have you considered what business metrics will be tracked and how they will be captured? For example, the time it takes today to close a case from the date a hearing is request to the date the judge's decision is recorded.
A50: The WCB anticipates updating its current performance management program.

Q51: Do you currently have issues with duplicate data (for example, multiple records of the same employer) because participants are not stored uniquely or new employers are created in different offices? This duplication of information impacts your ability to effectively report on your data and measure key performance indicators.
A51: Some reporting from within the current claims information system is unavailable because of underlying design and process decisions made in the mid 1990s.

Q52: We understand that your current business processes span across areas (e.g. Disability Benefits Bureau, UEF, Rehabilitation Unit, etc.). Our experience has been that while these areas are related, they generally follow distinct business processes. How integrated are the processes and data across areas today, and how integrated would they be in the future? The relationship between WC and other areas such as those stated above should be clearly defined from a business process, data sharing and roles and responsibilities perspective.
A52: Yes, the relationship between the workers' compensation and related business processes should be clearly defined.

Q53: Have you considered providing online access to public information regarding workers' compensation claims/cases?
A53: The WCB provides online access to public information regarding workers' compensation claim data. There are specific provisions of New York's workers' compensation law which prohibit the release of claim specific data which narrowly defines "public information" in New York.

Q54: 1 - Introduction "...central repository … to ensure timely, complete, and accurate data will be available…". Can specifics be provided to describe data - either coarse-grained by category or fine-grained by data element?

A54: While enhanced business intelligence will likely be an outcome of a new claims management system, the development of a data warehouse and supporting information architecture is not within the scope of this project.

Q55: 1 - Introduction "….needs of our system stakeholders…" Can a list, description, and approximate number (by type) of each stakeholder be provided, including distinctions to those who work internal (i.e. NYS WCB users) and external (i.e. insurance, legal, etc)?

A55: A list of stakeholder groups was provided in the RFI. The WCB anticipates additional stakeholder details will be included in subsequent RFPs.

Q56: 2 - Project Overview"…reduce overall system cost…" Is there a current business case developed that details these costs and the approximate savings to be gained from the implementation of changes?

A56: No.

Q57: 2 - Project Overview"… WCB exchanges data with a number of other state agencies and interacts with a number of advocacy groups …" Can an inventory of the data exchanges be provided, along with details for each (frequency, method, type of data exchanged, etc)

A57: Insofar as it may help define the scope of a reengineering endeavor, the WCB will likely include this information in an RFP.

Q58: 2 - Project Overview "…bound by law…" Are there an planned changes to existing WCB law, case law, and regulation that we should know about for the purposes of this effort?

A58: It is possible that during the envisioning process system stakeholders will advocate for changes to the current law or regulations governing workers' compensation in New York.

Q59: 2 - Project Overview "…projects of this type and magnitude…" How is magnitude judged in this case? By number of stakeholder categories? By number of applications? Number of users? Number of As-Is Processes to be reviewed? Number of estimated workdays? Some other category?

A59: The workers' compensation system in New York covers over 5 million workers and costs New Yorkers over $5 billion annually. The RFI identifies a number of system stakeholders who should participate in envisioning and requirements gathering process.

Q60: 2.5 - Business Process Re-engineering methods Do all your system stakeholders/subject matter experts (SMEs) based in Albany or are they scattered statewide?

A60: System stakeholders are across New York State.

Q61: 2.8 - Project Management – Deliverables Are there specific deliverables define in the NYS Project Management Guidebook that NYS WCB considers mandatory or optional?
A61: A subset of project management deliverables will be identified as mandatory.

Q62: 2.11 - Technology - System Selection and Integration Is the recommendation sought here to focus on HW/SW selection? And if so, are there NYS WCB guidelines or design principles that can be used to help inform the selection criteria?
A62: Please see responses to Q1, Q2 and Q3.

Q63: 2.11 - Technology - System Selection and Integration Is the recommendation to also focus on Network Infrastructure and deployment / Operations recommendations?
A63: Please see responses to Q1, Q2 and Q3.

Q64: 2.12 - Technology - Electronic Data Interchange Does NYS WCB currently use an industry standard Edi format for any of its data exchange, and if so which one(s)?
A64: Yes, the WCB uses the IAIABC standard Proof of Coverage transaction.

Q65: 2.14 - Performance Measures What KPIs does NYS WCB currently use for formally tracking Performance Management, and in what ways are these measures seen as sufficient / insufficient?
A65: The WCB anticipates updating its current performance management program.

Q66: What software or toolset does NYS WCB use to assist with process modeling?
A66: MetaStorm ProVision is the primary process modeling tool used.

Q67: What timeline does NYS WCB envision for the start-to-finish accomplishment of objectives set forth in the RFI?
A67: The WCB expects to complete envisioning and requirements gathering in 12-18 months from the start of this phase.

Q68: Will the selected vendor be allowed to participate on future procurements such as the implementation/systems integration or QA effort?
A68: Please refer to Q5.

Q69: What are the key objectives for this project in order of priority?
A69: To replace a 15 year old Claims Information System with the technology and process that best addresses the needs of system stakeholders.

Q70: What are the success criteria (objective dates and metrics) in order of priority for the project?
A70: The primary success criteria of the envisioning and requirements gathering phase of the project is to develop the comprehensive understanding of all system stakeholder requirements to ensure future investments in technology, process and people at the WCB meet these needs.

Q71: How will the project be governed to manage scope, budget, timeline, fulfillment of the success metrics, return on investment?

    a. How will governance participants be recruited, vetted for engaged participation, retained to minimize re-education of replacements?

    b. What influence will the vendor have on the governance structure?

    c. Who will be the WCB Project Manager for this project? What is this person's position within the WCB?

A71: The WCB expects to learn from the vendor community experience about the optimal project governance team and process.

Q72: What are the guiding principles in order of priority of the WCB for the progression of this project?

    a. For instance, will speed to delivery of deliverables take precedence over the importance of maintaining scope of assessment?

    b. Will lowered risk of final recommendations take precedence over the cost of mitigating risk?

A72: The WCB expects to learn from the vendor community experience about articulating the optimal project guiding principles for a project of this type.

Q73: What predetermined decision-making guidelines (example: focus on identifying 80% of the solution, rather than the 20% of exceptions) will the project need to adhere to?

    a. What is the program team's ability to establish, and maintain adherence to, timelines for decision-making?

    b. What are WCB's standard decision-making escalation procedures?

A73: The WCB expects to learn from the vendor community experience about the optimal decision-making apparatus required by a project of this type.

Q74: What are WCB's standard risk management procedures?

    a. What are WCB's standard mitigation escalation procedures?

A74: The WCB expects to learn from the vendor community experience about the optimal risk management procedures for a project governance team and process.

Q75: Regarding WCB past process improvement programs:

    a. Provide an example of a successful program. What made it successful?

    b. Provide an example of a failed program. What learnings were identified?

A75: The Administrative Inventories (i.e. 2002) published by the Workers' Compensation Research Institute are sources of WCB successes and attention points. Please refer to WCB website for additional information.

Q76: What agencies govern the appropriate Workers' Compensation laws? What is the expectation for collaborating with, or gaining consensus from, these agencies?

    a. To what degree, if any, will collaboration with the New York Compensation Insurance Rating Board be permitted?

    b. To what degree, if any, will collaboration with the National Council on Compensation Insurance (NCCI) be permitted?

A76: The New York State Insurance Department and the Workers' Compensation Board administer New York's workers' compensation law. The WCB expects the envisioning and requirements gathering phase will involve all appropriate system stakeholders.

Q77: Are there other initiatives that will be affected by, or will affect, the progression of this program? Please list known interactions and dependencies.
A77: None are known at this time.

Q78: What environmental considerations (example: technology that is not eligible for replacement) will the project need to adhere to?
       a. Maintenance and support for existing software/hardware environments?
       b. Requirements concerning usage and accessibility of historical data?
A78: Please refer to Q1, Q2 and Q3.

Q79: What administrative areas and supporting processes of the WCB will be included in the scope of the BPR?
       a. Human Resources
       b. Finance
       c. WCB Administration
       d. Procurement
       e. Information Technology
       f. Policy and Program Development
       g. Quality control processes, including peer reviews
A79: Reengineering these processes only as they interact with claims management activities is envisioned.

Q80: What documentation already exists for known WCB service delivery model requirements? Potential sources for this information include customer call logs, IT issue logs, etc.
A80: Additional information is required by the WCB to answer this question.

Q81: What are the known points of existing electronic interface that the WCB requires be maintained going forward?
A81: The WCB expects that all system participants that interact with the WCB today will continue to have that capability under any future implementation.

Q82: Process Areas as referred to in pages 14 to 21:
       a. What level of documentation exists for each of the in scope process areas and
       service providers?
       b. How are they validated for compliance and accuracy?
       c. How are exceptions to the processes documented, tracked, evaluated for their
       resolution accuracy?
       d. How are the body of exceptions evaluated for future improvements to standard
       processes to avoid future exceptions?
A82: Please refer to Q12 and Q23.

Q83: What are the expectations of the WCB for the vendor to follow the tenets and practices of the New York State Project Management Guidebook?
A83: Please refer to Q61.

Q84: What is the WCB's expectations for the following:
　　　a. Program Management Office Creation and Administration
　　　b. Program Document Management
　　　c. Quality Assurance
　　　d. Approval / Acceptance of Deliverables
　　　e. Tools and process for Issue Tracking and resolution
A84: The WCB expects to learn from the vendor community experience about articulating the optimal structure and process for a project of this type.

Q85: Please provide WCB's requirements for project status reporting to external constituents, specifically the following:
　　　a. NY state legislators – timing, format
　　　b. NY state agencies – timing, format
　　　c. NY State Bar – timing, format
　　　d. NY State public – timing, format
　　　e. AFL-CIO – timing, format
　　　f. NY State Insurance Department – timing, format
　　　g. NY State Courts and Legislature – timing, format
A85: The WCB will articulate project status reporting requirements in any subsequent RFP released in support of this initiative.

Q86: What policies / expectations does WCB have regarding involving the WCB stakeholder community when subject matter expertise is required for the production of program deliverables?
A86: The WCB expects that all system stakeholders will fully participate in the envisioning and requirements gathering phase.

Q87: What is WCB's requirements for the following infrastructure:
　　　a. Project website with file storage, calendar, discussions, etc.
　　　b. Time/expense tracking of all project personnel, including WCB subject matter experts.
A87: The WCB expects to learn from the vendor community experience about articulating the optimal project repository and tracking tools.

Q88: What is the expectation for knowledge transfer of the process re-engineering methodology and its deliverables to internal WCB personnel for ongoing maintenance?
A88: The WCB expects that the Office of Continuous Improvement's Business Process Management methodology may be refined as a result of this project.

Q89: What are the expectations of WCB for the vendor to provide feedback on the performance of WCB staff participation in this project?

A89: The WCB expects that the project management and governance processes will encourage comprehensive feedback on the performance of all staff working on this project.

Q90: What is WCB's position and exceptions for representatives assigned to the team part time or full time to have authority and support as a proxy for the area of responsibility to make decisions with respect to the following:

    a. Confirming and prioritizing functional requirements;
    b. Qualifying the viability of process changes;
    c. Approving technology features and opportunities for automation; and,
    d. Identifying gaps; etc.

A90: The WCB expects to learn from the vendor community experience about articulating the optimal project governance structure to enable the local decision making required to keep the project moving forward.

Q91: What responsibility will the service provider have in the following:

    a. Development and administration of all required solicitations for the goods and services associated with the completion of this project;
    b. Recommendations and ongoing assistance in the selection of goods and services; and,
    c. Contract negotiation and management support for the selection of goods and services.

A91: We do not expect the selected vendor to play a role in solicitations or procurements that result from the envisioning and requirements gathering phase. The vendor's involvement will be limited to reviewing the range of potential solutions and helping inform WCB recommendations.

Q92: What is the full list of technology platforms that are in scope of the functional teams to be assessed?

    a. Software, hardware, network topology.
    b. What software and version is the off-the-shelf claims management system (page 19) that is utilized by the WCB?

A92: Please refer to Q1, Q2 and Q3.

Q93: What are the external agencies and legal statutes governing WCB use of the following technologies:

    a. Social networking tools (business example: data source for fraud detection)
    b. Blogs (business example: driving awareness of key issues for providers/insurers)
    c. Business Intelligence tools (business examples: trends of injuries for prevention training, fraud detection, unstructured data analysis of customer sentiment, etc.)

A93: It is unusual for specific technologies to be identified in the statutes and regulations that govern their use by the WCB.

Q94: What is the relationship of the WCB to the NY Chief Information Officer/NYS Office for Technology and how do the policies of that agency govern WCB's use of technology? For example, but not limited to the following:

a. The use and management of electronic records;

b. Security policies related to access to and transmission personal health information;

c. Governmental employers' appropriate storage / access to employee e-mail;

d. Attorney responsibilities relative to e-discovery; and,

e. NY State's e-mail consolidation and e-mail archiving policies.

A94: As an executive agency of the state of New York, the WCB adheres to the policies and directives of the New York State Chief Information Officer.

Q95: Please provide any available documentation on WCB's enterprise data architecture, data ownership, and maintenance expectations.
A95: Please refer to Q54.

Q96: What data sources or agencies does the WCB interface with to track demographics about its target customer base and or data related to serving the customer base:

a. NY workers

b. Eligible survivors of deceased workers

c. NY employers, active and inactive

d. Department of Labor

e. Claimant Representative Licensed Representatives

f. Office of the Fraud Inspector General

g. New York State Attorney General and local district attorney offices

h. Civil courts

i. Third Party Administrators

j. Workers' Compensation law

k. Insurance carriers

l. Medical providers (example data points: authorized service types, benefits provided)

m. Attorneys and law firms

n. State agencies for reporting benefits/payments provided to claimants

o. State agencies for reporting service payments reimbursed to providers

A96: The WCB is unable to answer this question without additional details.

Q97: What is the WCB's High Level Estimate of costs related to this effort?

a. Does this include internal soft costs of dedicated resources and hard costs of purchased goods and services?

b. What level of detail / standard format regarding costs does the vendor need to submit to comply with WCB Procurement policies?

A97: The WCB has not yet detailed a high level cost estimate including internal soft costs and looks to the vendor community for cost expectations based on their experience with similar projects.

Q98: What is the WCB's expectations regarding Return on Investment & Total Cost of Ownership?
A98: The WCB believes that ROI and TCO must inform any recommendations for future investment in technology.

Q99: What is the WCB's expectations regarding paper reduction?
A99: The WCB expects to continue to look for ways to eliminate paper in the claims management process.

Q100: How many attendees are allowed for each vendor?
A100: Please refer to Q7 and Q9.

Q101: What information about the attendees needs to be submitted before the roundtable meeting?
A101: The WCB requires vendors to provide the name and vendor affiliation of all roundtable attendees. Optionally, the WCB will request contact information.

Q102: What vendor exhibits or examples of work will be expected to be shared at the roundtable meeting?
        a. Will vendor exhibits or examples of work need to be submitted in paper form?
        b. How many copies should be prepared?
A102: Vendors may submit materials at the roundtable but the WCB expects that these materials will be submitted with the vendor's formal response to the RFI.

Q103: What topics will be covered during the structured discussion between WCB representatives and the vendor community?
A103: Please see page 22 of the Request for Information.

Q104: Fundamentally, there are two approaches to BPR. The first is to design the "system" around functional/technical/non-functional requirements and then to re-engineer business process around the system context. The second is design re-engineer business process and then to build the "system" around the context of designed business processes. Has the Board made any fundamentally strategic decisions around the approach it wishes to pursue?
A104: No, the WCB expects to obtain this information from the vendor community.

Q105: What are the top three motivational business drivers of the Board's BPR initiative?
A105: Cost, improve customer service and improve efficiencies.

Q106: What is the Board's vision/mission statement guiding this project?
A106: Please refer to Q71 and Q72.

Q107: All BPR and requirements gathering starts with understanding the current process of the organization. This is truly a "organizational effort", often most efficiently conducted by internal Board staff with years of institutional knowledge. Has the Board considered training current staff in an "as-is" business process documentation standard for initial inputs for the BPR effort?
Q107: Please refer to Q44.

Q108: Has the Board considered the potential role of an Independent Verification and Validation "auditor" to assist the Board in project governance and as a check and balance to external vendors?
A108: Please refer to Q38.

Q109: Will the Board's HR division be included as a primary project stakeholder?
A109: This has not yet been determined.

Q110: In the end, the success/failure of BPR is about people, not technology. How mature is the Board's internal training and staff development processes?
A110: The WCB has a dedicated Staff Development bureau which is relatively mature.

Q111: Has the Board already conducted enterprise data flow mapping?
A111: For more than a decade, the WCB has had an Office of Continuous Improvement Bureau which has created data flow mapping for many areas, however, we do not have enterprise wide data flow mapping.

Q112: What are the Board's non-functional requirements of any new system enabling the re-engineered business processes?
A112: To be determined.

Q113: Does the Board currently undergo any external system or financial audits?
A113: Yes, as directed by NYS control agencies.

Thank you for your interest in providing services to the Workers' Compensation Board.

Sincerely,

Michelle M. Schultz
Contract Administration