EAST BAY
MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)
for Risk Management Information System (RMIS) – Responses to Questions

June 30, 2025

1. Users and Roles: it was stated within the RFP that EBMUD will require the following user licenses. What are the roles and functions of the "Users" and "Power Users"? Our team provides all administrator-type functions as part of the initial implementation and ongoing support. We'll remove this requirement from our submission. This can certainly be further discussed during the next phase.
   This will help determine the appropriate license type in our submission.
   a. Users – 7
   b. Power Users - 3
   c. Administrators – 2
      - Administrator should have full system privileges (managing other user accounts). Power Users should have full functionality in developing reports. Specific administrator functions to be determined at a later point.

2. Questions re data migration:
   a. Outside of claims data from the current in-house solution and Carl Warren (TPA), what other type of data is the City looking to have migrated? Typically, our customers have migrated (in csv format): insurance policies, asset schedules (properties, vehicles and equipment) certificates of insurance (if using the COI module) and contacts, (vendors, lawyers, etc.)
      - No non-claim related data will be migrated.
   b. What is the current size of data needing to be migrated: GB and number of total records/type?
      - Yes. Approximately 300 GB and 85,000 files.
   c. Are file attachments required for the upload? What is the total storage size of files needing migration? What are the file types
      - Yes; file types include image files, PDFs, .docx

3. Where is the current employee data stored and is it exportable on a regular basis to a .csv?
   - No employee data is currently being stored.

4. Please provide details on the requested integrations below, specifically what type of data will be requested, is the organization seeking one-way or bi-directional integration and what's the use case for each, and which if any, are required for the initial implementation (to be included in the proposal for costing purposes):
   a. TPAs
      - Carl Warren: will this be an ongoing data feed or a one-time for historical claims?
         - One time migration.
   b. Oracle
      - We understand the financial integration requested. Further scoping would be required during the next phase.
         - Not required for initial implementation.
   c. Employee Data
      - Does all Employee Data reside within Oracle as well? We provide a standard data feed from the internal database into our solution to maintain employee records, supervisors and departments. Even though EBMUD is not reporting on WC right now, this data feed is still crucial to the ongoing maintenance and structure of the solution as employees will be submitting data and will be involved in liability and other claim types. This can be discussed during the next phase.
      - Not required for initial implementation.

5. Do you currently, or have in the past, used an RMIS system before?
      - No.

6. Is the City seeking a commercial off-the-shelf solution with configuration capabilities or a fully customizable solution and implementation?
      - Off-the-shelf solutions should be sufficient for our needs.

7. Please define the 12 users as follows:

   a. Number of Read/Write Users
      - none.

   b. Number of Read/Write users with Report Development Capabilities
      - 12 users.

8. Will the District require ongoing data feeds from MicroNiche, and if so, for what purpose?
   - No, only one-time migration.

9. Would the District have interest in using our integrated document management system as an alternative to SharePoint integration? The integrated document management module is purpose-built to support claim workflow and automation.
   - We are interested in further discussing integrated document management.

10. Could you please clarify whether the vendor is required to obtain insurance verification signatures from an insurance broker or agent, or if it is acceptable for an authorized officer of the vendor to provide the required signatures instead, at the time of submission of this RFP?
    - An Officer or the Risk Manager of the vendor's company may sign the verifications. Signatures are not required at the time of submission, only when executing service agreement.

11. What's the difference in security/permissions for the three different 'user communities described in section D.3 of the Technical Requirements? I.e., Users, Power Users, Administrators.
    - Administrator should have full system privileges (managing other user accounts). Power Users should have full functionality in developing reports.

12. The first paragraph of the "AGREEMENT" section in Exhibit C – IT SERVICES AGREEMENT refers to: Exhibit A Scope of Services; Exhibit B Payment Terms and Procedures; and Exhibit C Insurance Requirements, but Insurance Requirements is labeled as Exhibit B in the RFP, and there is no "Payment Terms and Procedures" exhibit. How will this inconsistency be addressed? Additionally, this same paragraph labels Exhibit A as "Scope of Services" but Exhibit A in the RFP document is listed as "RFP Response Packet". This may just be two different terms for the same topic. Please confirm.
    - There is no inconsistency; the RFP includes a service agreement which is separate and distinct from the RFP and is provided as reference only.

13. Are Carl Warren and FHE adjudicating any other liability claims outside of General Liability, and Auto Liability? If so, what other liability claims are adjudicated by Carl Warren and FHE?
    - Employer's liability/employment discrimination

Do you have any Liability claims that are not adjudicated by Carl Warren and FHE? If so, is that data stored in MicroNiche or on spreadsheets?

- Yes (subrogation claims); stored both in MicroNiche and spreadsheets.

14. What type of incidents will be submitted through the portal?
Approximately how many internal users will have access to report an incident via the portal?

- N/A, only seeking claims management solution.

15. The opening paragraph in the RFP mentioned Site inspections. Is this a requirement? If so, how many different Site inspections are conducted by the East Bay Municipal Utility District?

- Approximately 50 site visits annually as relates to liability claims against the District.

Approximately how many individuals are conducting these inspections?

- 5

Is there a different team that tracks and manages the corrective actions that result from these site inspections?

- No

Or will it be the corrective actions be managed by the same team conducting the Site inspections?

- n/a

16. What data is currently stored in MicroNiche? Ex: Claim, Claim Transactions, notes, claim supporting documents such as pictures, pdf documents etc.

- MicroNiche stores Claim Transactions, notes, claim supporting documents such as photos, pdf documents etc.

Will there be any historical attachments that will need to be loaded from MicroNiche? If so, can you provide an approximate volume?

- Yes. Approximately 300 GB and 85,000 files.

17. Import Purchase Order data
Can you provide clarity on this data integration? Will you require the RMIS system to track Purchase order data? Are these purchase orders related to claims or potential claims?

- No, the new system will not be required to track purchase order data in detail, that is done in the Oracle Cloud Fusion ERP, but the new system should be able to hold reference fields for Purchase order number and vendor name at a minimum. This information would be needed to allow an export to have the new system be able to submit, via an integration, a payment request that references the PO Number.

18. Export Vendor Payment information.
Can you provide clarity on this data integration? Are these claim payments for Purchase order specific claims? Or are you envisioning utilizing the RMIS system to track Purchase order payments?
    - This would be for payments made for services provided that may be related to the claim, investigations, legal fees, etc. Payments would be trackable in the system of record, but the future goal would be to have some integration between the claim system and our ERP Payables module to allow for smooth processing of payments made for a particular claim.

19. Within the RFP it is mentioned that we are to submit our responses directly on the forms provided such as the reference form and the proposal form. Can EBMUD provide a fillable form for these specific pages that we can complete and include in our proposal document?
    - Not at this time. Feel free to submit responses as attachments.

20. Will the district consider an extension for questions and exceptions to allow for all firms' legal teams to fully review the RFP and submit legal questions and exceptions pertaining to the RFP?
    - No.

21. Has the district established a budget for the RMIS system? If so, what is that budget? First year with implementation budget? Ongoing years annual budget?
    - Yes, budget has been established. Decline to provide further information.

22. Please provide the details of the current data to be migrated from the MicroNiche application to the proposed system. (Volume, quality of the data, etc.)
23. Please provide more information on the historical data conversion from MicroNiche. What type of data needs to be mapped to the new system (claims, notes, transactions, etc.)? How many claims? How many file attachments? How large is the database? Please be as detailed as possible.

24. How many historical liability claims does the district have in the current system? What is the average annual volume of new claims? Does the district need to manage any other lines of business outside of liability claims?

- Response to Questions 22, 23, 24: Claims, Claim Transactions, notes, claim supporting documents such as pictures, pdf documents etc. Approximately 300 GB and 85,000 files. Approximately 300 claims per year, with at least 10 years of prior claims to be imported.

25. The RFP describes three different user types: 7 users, 3 power users and 2 administrators. Please confirm the total user count is a total of 12. Please describe what each user group will be doing within the system and the level of system access each need. Please be as detailed as possible.

- Better positioned to answer following a demonstration.

26. How many different incident types does the district currently report? Are near misses or any other recordables currently being tracked? What is the annual volume for new incidents on an annual basis?

- Incidents are defined as claims or potential liability claims against the District. Approximately 300.

27. How many different dashboards are required to be configured? Does the district desired dashboards unique to each individual user or by role?

- At least 4 dashboards for different user roles: Claims Adjuster, Claims Supervisor, Program Manager, Limited Use/Temporary Access.

28. Please describe desired payment milestones. Are other payment terms for first year and implementation accepted?

- Open to negotiation, typically 30% at production cutover.

29. Is this a new RFP or are there any incumbents?

- New.

30. Do we need to submit identified resources as team members or sample resumes will work?

- Identified resources as team members.

31. Any major projects planned in coming years that vendors should be aware of?

- None at this time.

32. What are the primary business drivers for issuing this RFP?
    - Replacing an outdated legacy system.

33. Are offshore resources allowed for this RFP?
    - No.

34. What is the format of liability claims data that the system needs to import and process?
    - Predominantly .csv files.

35. Will the District supply interface specifications (field formats, frequency, transport method) for:
    a. - SIMS liability feed
        - N/A
    b. - Oracle Fusion Payables one-time payment request
        - Yes.
    c. - Purchase-order imports?
        - Yes.

36. Is there a middleware in place that we must use (e.g. MuleSoft), or do you expect the vendor to expose APIs and secure file-drops independently?
    - No middleware is in place.

37. How many test loads and cut-over rehearsals are expected?
    - Minimum of 2 cut-over rehearsals.

38. Will the District require logs and extracted CSVs to be digitally signed or hashed to make them "legally defensible", and if so, which signing standard?
    - Preferred though not required for proposal compliance but will be considered positively in proposal evaluations if proposed RMIS system supports industry standard digital signature or cryptographic hashing capabilities for key data outputs.

39. How is uptime to be measured—synthetic transaction from District network or external monitor?
    - Either.

40. Is 99.99 % required for the whole calendar month or only Monday-Friday 08:00-17:00 PT?

- Yes, the whole calendar month.

41. What financial credits or penalties will be applied for missed SLA?
    - Specific financial credits, penalties, or other remedies for failure to meet service level expectations may be negotiated prior to contract execution or incorporated in the Service Level Agreement (SLA).

42. Must the test environment mirror production data volume and is a segregated network (air-gap) required for security accreditation testing?
    - Test environment volume does not need to mirror production volume. We do expect the vendor to have network segmentation/firewall between test and production environments, as this is an considered security best practice. This does not require full air-gap, but we don't expect the environments to be wide open between each other (i.e. all ports, IP's and protocols allowed bi-directionally).

43. How many distinct training cohorts (end users, power users, admins) and total learners are expected?
    - 2; power user and administrator training.

44. Is in-person training at EBMUD sites needed, or will virtual instructor-led sessions suffice?
    - Virtual is sufficient.

45. If we quote the optional WC module now, will it be evaluated in the current cost score or treated as a future change order?
    - Future change order.

46. What is the process to handle change requests out of the scope?
    - Submit formal request in writing by either party, to be agreed upon by both parties prior to commencement of any work.