

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # FAS-3150  
Addendum

**Updated on 08/05/2013**

The following is additional information regarding Request for Proposal # FAS-3150, titled **Benefit Data Warehouse**, released on 7/10/13. **The due date and time for responses remains as 08/09/13 at 1:00 PM** (Pacific). This addendum includes both questions from prospective proposers and the City's answers, and revisions to the RFP. This addendum is hereby made part of the RFP and therefore, the information contained herein shall be taken into consideration when preparing and submitting a proposal.

Item #	Date Received	Date Answered	Vendor's Question	City's Answer	RFP Revisions
1	7/15/13	7/16/13	Would the City of Seattle be willing to enter into an NDA with an interested proposer as part of the RFP process? Is this already part of your process?	No. The City of Seattle cannot enter into a Non-Disclosure Agreement to not disclose a Proposer's proposal because under Washington State Law (reference RCW Chapter 42.56, the <i>Public Records Act</i> ) all materials received or created by the City of Seattle are considered public records. These records include but are not limited to: Bid or proposal submittals, Agreement documents, Contract work product, or Other bid material. Section 9.21 of the RFP, Proprietary Proposal Material, describes the City's process regarding the handling of proprietary proposal submittals and provides instructions to Proposers who wish to designate certain sections of their Proposal as proprietary.	No RFP revisions.
2	7/17/13	7/17/13	I am not able to answer the questions in Attachment 4 in the format provided due to text getting pushed off the page because the grids won't expand. Am I able to take the text out of the grids and leave the same numbering for the questions?	If the grids won't expand, it is acceptable to answer the questions on another sheet, keeping the question numbers in the same order.	No RFP revisions.
3	7/17/13	7/18/13	In regards to the archive data (1/1/2008 – 12/31/2010), are you requesting online access to the data or to have it	The City will need detailed data extracts from this archived dataset (including value-added analytics) upon request.	No RFP revisions.

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # FAS-3150  
Addendum

**Updated on 08/05/2013**

			archived and available upon request?	This historical data will help the City analysts build a more robust time series of detailed data.	
4	7/17/13	7/18/13	Please provide a description of the additional implementation tiers (phases) of your long-term data warehouse strategy, including identification of the data type(s) and estimated point in time for each of the phases for pricing purposes.	Descriptions of the additional tiers can be found in the Data Sources Attachment A. Data considered to be in an additional tier have been requested to be priced separately (not in the base pricing). The exact order of implementation is yet to be determined, but rough order is represented in the "Implementation Priority" column	No RFP revisions.
5	7/17/13	7/18/13	Why has the City issued an RFP for Data warehouse at this time?	Please see Section 2 (Purpose & Background) beginning on page one of the RFP.	No RFP revisions.
6	7/17/13	7/18/13	Who is your current data warehouse vendor? How long have they been providing data warehouse services to the City? Does this RFP require services beyond their current capabilities?	The City does not currently have data warehousing services.	No RFP revisions.
7	7/17/13	7/18/13	Are you requesting one data warehouse that contains the data for all city/fire/police populations, or do they need to be separated so that each entity can access their own data?	The City would prefer all requested data to be hosted in a single data warehouse. The City would welcome discussion about the possibility of different accessibility attributed to different users, but it is not a mandatory requirement.	No RFP revisions.
8	7/17/13	7/18/13	Is the reason you requested the eligibility from the City Pension System to be priced separately due to the data may be moved to an HRIS system?	The City has asked for this data to be priced separately since the timing of the Pension System's data transition to HRIS is unclear. The City may want to bring the data into the data warehouse	No RFP revisions.

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # FAS-3150  
Addendum

**Updated on 08/05/2013**

				prior to a full transition	
9	7/17/13	7/18/13	<p>In Section 5, Item 3 &amp; Section 7 – Vendor responsibilities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are the data extracts referenced intended to be from raw carrier data or post-analytic processing?</li> <li>2. If post-analytic processing, would it be limited to claim experience or also need to include value-added information such as episode grouping and health risk?</li> <li>3. Our experience with the vendors identified is that they generally provide data between the 15th and 22nd of the month following the experience period. Given this, is the “Date Sent by” negotiable based on when data is received/processed?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Post-analytic processing</li> <li>2. It also needs to include value-added information</li> <li>3. Exact timing of the extracts is negotiable as noted by the <i>estimated</i> timeframe in the RFP.</li> </ol>	No RFP revisions.
10	7/17/13	7/18/13	<p>On page 23, under Section 12 Award and Contract Execution Instructions/Instructions to the Apparently Successful Vendor(s), we are referred to Section 6 for instructions about exceptions, but the RFP’s section 6 is Licensing and Business Tax Requirements. There are no instructions about exceptions in section 6. Please confirm that the totality of instructions referenced are on page 20-21, Acceptance &amp; Exceptions to City Contract?</p>	<p>All instructions for the acceptance and exceptions to the City contract are located on pages 20-21 (Section 10, under Proposal Format), titled “Acceptance &amp; Exceptions to City Contract”.</p>	<p>On page 23 of the RFP, under Section 12, the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph under “Instructions to the Apparently Successful Vendor(s)”, the reference to the exception instructions has been corrected to read “(Section 10)”.</p>
11	7/17/13	7/18/13	<p>The document titled W9 2012.pdf, on</p>	<p>If you are having difficulty opening he</p>	<p>On page 24 of the RFP, Section 12,</p>

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # FAS-3150  
Addendum

**Updated on 08/05/2013**

			page 24, Taxpayer Identification Number and W-9 was created in ArcoExch and we are unable to open it. Are you able to send document in a different format	attached W-9 document, you can also access it here: <a href="http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/fw9.pdf">http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/fw9.pdf</a>	under "Taxpayer Identification Number and W-9", the attachment has been replaced and updated.
12	7/24/13	7/24/13	How will the data be separated according to Attachment #A as it comes into the data warehouse?	Attachment A is split up by data feeds. Each line in the Vendors column (column B) is a potentially separate data feed.	No RFP revisions.
13	7/24/13	7/24/13	How many copies of the RFP must be supplied?	1 original, 7 copies, and 1 CD.	No RFP revisions.
14	7/24/13	7/24/13	Where are the instructions regarding how many copies of the RFP to supply with submittal?	Page 18, Section 10. Letter "B" under General Instructions.	No RFP revisions.
15	7/24/13	7/24/13	How was the RFP developed?	The RFP is based on current needs within the department and a consultant, Towers Watson, helped write it.	No RFP revisions.
16	7/24/13	7/24/13	Is there a budget for this project?	While we have an idea of what it might cost, no financial boundary has been set. We are focused more on the content of the proposals and if it is worth the asking price.	No RFP revisions.
17	7/24/13	7/24/13	Will the list of attendees of the pre-proposal conference be available online?	Yes, the list will be posted online at <a href="http://www.seattle.gov/purchasing">www.seattle.gov/purchasing</a> . Click on the RFP under "Current Purchasing Solicitations", and find the Pre-Proposal Conference Attendees List.	No RFP revisions.
18	7/24/13	7/26/13	What changes are there, if any, in data sources and/or funding arrangements for 2008-2010 that are not captured in the data supplier appendix?	All information pertaining to historical funding and data sources should already be included in Attachment A, the Data Sources spreadsheet.	No RFP revisions.
19	7/24/13	7/26/13	Are there any population headcount	There should be no <i>significant</i>	No RFP revisions.

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # FAS-3150  
Addendum

**Updated on 08/05/2013**

			differences for 2008-2010 versus 2011-2013?	differences (~5%) for the historical employee counts in the Employee/Member estimates listed in Attachment A. There is however, a natural ebb and flow that occurs from economic impacts and resulting budget pressures.	
20	7/24/13	7/26/13	How often does the City anticipate needing to access "archived" 2008 - 2010 data?	The City would like to be able to access the data as needed. But depending on advanced planning and work between the City and chosen vendor, the correct fields could be extracted in a single data pull. In reality, it may take a handful of data pulls.	No RFP revisions.
21	7/24/13	7/26/13	<p>The solicitation makes many references to the need to perform benefits modeling. Those include:</p> <p>From p.2: The long-term vision would include modeling various City of Seattle employee benefits included (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medical/Pharmacy;</li> <li>• Dental;</li> <li>• Vision;</li> <li>• Long-Term Disability; and</li> <li>• Workers' Compensation.</li> </ul> <p>From p.3: Select a vendor that can implement robust benefit design modeling capabilities.</p>	<p>To clarify, the modeling identified in the first reference is meant to be a more general use of the word 'modeling' that may include many different types of analysis (e.g. econometric modeling of raw data, cost driver analysis, plan modeling, etc.) whereas the other two references are specific to benefit plan design modeling.</p> <p>Part of the functionality the City is requesting to see is benefits plan modeling, including changing cost sharing, benefit limits, etc.. While this functionality is not deemed mandatory or part of the base pricing, the City is interested in understanding the full spectrum of the respondents' capabilities in this area since it is something the City may choose to implement now and/or in the future.</p>	No RFP revisions.

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # FAS-3150  
Addendum

**Updated on 08/05/2013**

			<p>From p.7: Providing benefit plan scenario modeling capabilities.</p> <p>How important is benefits modeling to City of Seattle and how rigorous of a tool is required for the types of modeling the city plans to do?</p>	<p>Please provide separate pricing if your capabilities include a stand-alone tool.</p>	
22	7/30/13	7/31/13	<p>Please provide more detail around the specific data extract you will require to facilitate your financial projections and modeling. We understand the modified basis, we're just wondering if this extract might be custom in nature and require some additional costing. Please help us understand as much detail around this extract and the data you will require.</p>	<p>If the volume of data needed for our projection work is greater than what we can pull from the reporting tool, we would need a file extracted, either at a claim or at a person level that would contain the fields we need, including, but not limited to, claim dollar amounts, service counts, risk scores, claims classification (IP, OP, ER, Physician, etc.).</p> <p>Please provide any additional cost for providing such extracts.</p>	No RFP revisions.
23	7/31/13	7/31/13	<p>For non-standard data sets (absenteeism, Workers comp) does the City want these sets integrated with the standard Medical administrative data? Will reporting requirements require aggregation of these data sets? Or does the City want to receive the data sets through an extract and do their own ad hoc analytics?</p>	<p>The City would prefer all types of data to be integrated into a single database in which a user is able to access and create reports that pull from each type of data simultaneously.</p>	No RFP revisions.
24	7/31/13	7/31/13	<p>RFP Section 2, pg 2 – The RFP states, “The City expects all monthly data to be updated on a modified quarterly basis.” How often is data expected to be provided by the data suppliers? With</p>	<p>We expect the data to be provided by the vendors monthly with most data updated in the application on a (modified) quarterly basis. The data warehouse update frequency</p>	No RFP revisions.

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # FAS-3150  
Addendum

**Updated on 08/05/2013**

			what frequency is the database expected to be refreshed?	expectations for each data feed is listed in Attachment A in the "Update Frequency" column. We need monthly data but whether the providers send the vendor info monthly and the update is batched, or the providers send batched data that is updated as such may be negotiable depending on the different providers needs/preferences.	
25	7/31/13	7/31/13	RFP Section 7, Vendor Responsibilities, Item 1, pg 6 – How often are new vendors [data suppliers] expected to be added? Is it anticipated that this could occur at any time throughout the contract term?	It is more likely that a vendor would be replaced not added. The City rarely adds providers. Our contracts usually run 5 – 7 years, but Aetna has been in place since 2001; Group Health since the 1990s; WDS since the 1990s; and DHS replace Willamette dental in 2006.	No RFP revisions.
26	7/31/13	7/31/13	RFP Section 9.20, pg 14 – As stated in the RFP, "Proposer submittal must remain valid until City completes award. Should any Proposer object to this condition, the Proposer must provide objection through a question and/or complaint to the RFP Coordinator prior to the proposal due date." Is the City open to a shorter timeframe for the proposal to remain valid, such as 6 months? Without such a limit, the City could theoretically expect the proposal to be honored indefinitely.	The City has every intention of awarding the contract in a timely manner. In the event that contract negotiations with the highest ranked vendor fall through, the City may want to enter into negotiations with the second highest ranked vendor. This scenario may last longer than 6 months, which is why a deadline is not specified.	No RFP revisions.
27	7/31/13	7/31/13	RFP Section 10, Proposal Format, pg 19 – This section lists the "Inventory of Data Sources (Attachment A)" to be included in the proposal. However,	No, as noted in the citation in the question, Attachment A is included "For Reference" only.	No RFP revisions.

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # FAS-3150  
Addendum

**Updated on 08/05/2013**

			Attachment A is an informational document only. Understanding that the proposer needs to reference the data presented in Attachment A in some of its responses elsewhere, does something specific need to be included in the proposal re this Attachment A? Note that Table 3 – Submittal Checklist on pg 21 does not list Attachment A as an optional or mandatory proposal requirement.		
28	7/31/13	7/31/13	RFP Section 11, pg 22 – Does the list of names of persons who will be performing the demonstration need to be submitted with the proposal, or not until a vendor is selected to proceed to the demonstration round?	The names of people who will be performing the demonstrations will need to be submitted after the vendor has been selected to proceed to the demonstration round.	No RFP revisions.
29	7/31/13	7/31/13	Attachment A - Is it possible for the data suppliers to convert the Excel eligibility files to a text delimited format? To facilitate quality checks, it is important that files are submitted in a consistent manner. Excel spreadsheets do not typically adhere to best practice production rules so using them should be discouraged. While we can accept Excel formatted files, the quality checks cannot be performed on them.	If this request can be fully satisfied by changing the type in 'Save As' to .txt or .csv, then yes, the City can comply.	No RFP revisions.
30	7/31/13	8/5/13	Per Attachment #4, describe how adjustments are made for differences in population such as age, case mix, severity and geography. Are these adjustments made automatically?	Section C number 10: Refers to the benchmarking capabilities of the application and whether adjustments are made to mirror the City's population automatically in the tool or if there are "drop-down" boxes to pick whether or not adjustments would be applied to the	No RFP revisions.



City of Seattle Request for Proposal # FAS-3150  
Addendum

**Updated on 08/05/2013**

				benchmarks.	
31	7/31/13	8/5/13	Per Attachment #4, please provide more information on the J. FAS 106 data gathering: More specifically what is the source of the FAS 106 data and how will it be used as part of the solution?	Section C number 11(j): FAS 106 or GASB 43 and GASB 45 deal with postemployment benefits other than pensions. The City would like to know what reporting processes are in place to provide claims costs necessary for any GASB 43/45 type reporting that Seattle may be required to do to account for future post retirement health benefits liabilities.	No RFP revisions.
32					
33					
34					
35					