

Vendor Questions and ETF Answers for

Request for Proposal ETC0003 Benefits Administration System for the Department of Employee Trust Funds Wisconsin Retirement System



Issued by the State of Wisconsin
Department of Employee Trust Funds

Release Date: July 9, 2013

RFP ETC0003 VENDOR QUESTIONS AND ETF ANSWERS

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
Q1	A.1.3	3	The ETF website contains booklets, facts sheets and other documents that summarize the provisions of the various plans administered by ETF. It also contains links to the ETF administrative code. Please confirm that there are no other official plan/program documents, contracts, administrative procedures or any other document that could impact the solution proposed. Otherwise, please provide a copy of such documents.
A1			We believe that between the referenced material and the business rules identified in Appendix E.21 Enterprise Business Management Scenarios, ETF has identified all pertinent materials. As noted in the RFP, ETF has contracts with each of the third party carriers and providers; those contracts may codify activities that are listed as requirements in Appendix E.4 Functional Requirements. There are no other plan/program documents that could impact the solution proposed.
Q2	A.2.2	7-8	(a) The period between the issue date of the RFP (June 13) and the deadline to provide written questions (June 24) is relatively short, especially considering the magnitude of the RFP. Will ETF allow for additional written questions to be submitted after June 24 (even past the July 2 vendor conference) to enable vendors to propose the best BAS solution to ETF?
	B1.6.2	99-100	(b) The provided Calendar of Events provides for a BAS project start date of January 6, 2014, however no information on an expected go-live date of the BAS project is specified. Does ETF have an expected go-live date? The information provided on the "Data Integrity" cleansing project (expected to be completed by January 2016) states that it should be coordinated with the BAS project. Is it correct to assume that ETF does not anticipate the BAS project to be live prior to that project being completed?

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A2			<p>In addition to the questions submitted with the letter of intent and those asked at the bidder conference, ETF will provide (and post) answers to any other questions received in writing at the appropriate contact address before 4:00 PM, 26 July 2013.</p> <p>ETF does not have an expected go-live date – we depend on the vendor, with their experience in having done projects such as ours before, to be better able to estimate an appropriate go-live date. It is correct to assume that BAS will not go live until the Data Integrity project is complete.</p>
Q3	A.2.9	10	<p>Would it be possible to provide the list of items that will be part of the summary information which will be disclosed after the RFO (sic) opening?</p>
A3			<p>The information released subsequent to the RFP Response opening will be limited to the names (and possibly contact information) of the vendors who submitted responses.</p>
Q4	A.2.12 C.6.3.2	11 216	<p>Section A.2.12 states that RFP answers and other written exchanges between ETF and successful vendor will be incorporated by reference into the contract.</p> <p>Section C.6.3.2 states that the Statement of Work (SOW) will cover all work to be done.</p> <p>Can you clarify as to whether or not the vendor's proposal document will be considered to be part of the contract?</p>
A4			<p>Please refer to Section A.3.5 Order of Precedence. Note also that the SOWs defined in Section C.6.3.2 to which you refer are meant as per-phase documents, not as the single Statement of Work for the entire project and, as such, do not supersede the contractual requirements.</p>
Q5	A3.6	17	<p>Please confirm that the project budget is for the implementation and warranty periods.</p>
A5			<p>ETF so confirms</p>
Q6	B.1.3.5.1	73	<p>How does ETF envision the integration between the BAS and the new FMIS? Would ETF prefer the FMIS to be the point of entry for financial transactions where possible (e.g. entry of cash receipts, management of accounts receivable), with seamless integration with the BAS?</p>

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A6			Yes; further, we look to the vendor to assist in defining the interface so that ETF's financial and line of business operations are smoothly and most effectively integrated.
Q7	C.1.1	106	If a Vendor can provide several client references that meet ETF's basic criteria; while in some cases, one or more sub criteria might not be met by a particular client; would it be acceptable to submit the entire client reference to demonstrate our ability to meet ETF's overall reference requirement?
A7			Yes, within reason. If a vendor has a client with 100,000 members and 1 employer and another with 1,000 members and 800 employers, we would probably not accept the references. But we do not wish to unreasonably reject any reasonable proposer
Q8	C.1.2	107	In order to minimize impact on ETF staffing and resources as well as for our own efficiency, we believe that a good portion of the work should be done on the vendor's premises. This would require the Project Manager to spend more time on the vendor's premises during certain phases of the project than others, all the while ensuring an on-site presence by the vendor for the duration of the project. In addition, for some phases of the project, it will make more sense for vendors to have various subject matter experts on-site instead of the project manager. Would this satisfy ETF's onsite requirement?
A8			Yes, subject to more information in justification of this proposal that we would expect to be a part of the vendor's proposed project timeline and response. ETF does point out our preference for an on-site (at ETF) vendor Project Manager
Q9	C.7.3	245	<p>How many people for each training program (ETF users, ETF business analysts and technical staff, employers and employer's payroll service providers or service bureaus, TPAs) would need to be trained by the vendor?</p> <p>How many users at ETF would access the BAS solution?</p>

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A9			<p>Since ETF is unsure of the structure and make-up of any individual vendor's training proposal, we cannot tell you how many individuals would be in each program. The RFP specifies ETF's current numbers of users, technical staff, employers, and TPAs. We also have four Business Analysts. We do not know how many individuals would need to be trained at each employer or TPA; nor do we know how many different service providers and service bureaus would need to be trained.</p>
Q10	E.4	344	<p>Would it be possible to get a Word version of the tables in this section?</p>
A10			<p>The redacted version of the RFP is posted in both MS Word and PDF versions. Use the MS Word version.</p>
Q11	E.4.1.11	388	<p>Is the intent to continue to administer programs with Third Parties that are currently managed as such (e.g. ICI, LTDI)?</p>
A11			<p>Yes and No. ETF is constantly evaluating its methods of administration of programs such as ICI and LTDI to ensure the most effective and efficient administration of same. Regardless of where the programs are administered, ETF requires that all necessary program data be collected, processed, and stored in the BAS. Then, should a TPA be used, the BAS must also manage the restricted access (and possible automated exchange of data with the TPA's systems) necessary</p>
Q12	E.4.1.13	409	<p>Will employers submitting enrolments performed through their own portals utilize a standard format (e.g. ANSI X.12 834 or other)?</p>
A12			<p>There is currently no such standard format defined. ETF looks to the vendor to help us specify any pertinent data communications standards</p>
Q13	E.4.1.13	409	<p>Will employers submit employee cost-sharing breakdowns for benefits? If so, is there a requirement or desire to provide employers with payroll deductions through reporting or electronic interfaces, based on employee elections and the provided cost-sharing information?</p>
A13			<p>Employers currently provide a cost-sharing breakdown and will need to continue that practice. We also point out that enrollment in various benefit programs is often done through the employer, not ETF directly. However, we do not understand the follow-on question</p>

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
Q14	E.4.1.16	432	Is there any need for ongoing dependent eligibility verification (apart from Chapter 40 domestic partners) or support for periodic dependent audits?
A14			Yes, there is a need for ongoing eligibility verification as well as support for periodic dependent audits in multiple benefit programs
Q15	E.4.1.19	437	Is ETF amenable to a service model for payroll that includes value-added services (e.g. tax remittances, administration of garnishments, check printing, etc.) or is a self-administration model preferred?
A15			Due in part to a process that currently requires the issuance of payroll through the Department of Administration, ETF prefers the self-administration model
Q16	E.4.3.8	565	The requirements in this section imply that the solution will include a replacement for the current ACD and IVR solutions in place today. The introductory text to E.4.3.8 speaks more of integrating with the current IVR technologies. Please confirm your requirements with respect to the replacement of or integration with existing ACD and IVR technology.
A16			The vendor responding to this RFP is responsible for integrating with our existing IVR and ACD, not replacing them.
Q17	E.7	647	We understand that this section is to be completed by ETF and that no vendor action is required at this time. Please confirm.
A17			That is correct. The contents of Table 87 in Appendix E.7 have been redacted. The information will be available by download from a secure FTP site upon receipt of a signed NDA from the vendor
Q18	E.9.2.8	655	The functionality requirements section (E.4) do not explicitly mention buybacks. Please indicate whether ETS (sic) is seeking to maintain the Qualified/Forfeited BuyBack Application, or would prefer to incorporate it into the BAS functionality.
A18			ETF would prefer to incorporate <u>all</u> line of business activities into the BAS. We have no intention of retaining any of our current legacy applications.

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
Q19	C.1.1 Proposer Minimum Qualifications	106	If vendor has supported a Pension System which meets ETF's minimum client requirements (e.g., number of employers) through multiple phases over ten years, but the initial implementation was prior to ETF's five year requirement can this reference still qualify?
A19			Yes, as long as the other two references are within the past five years
Q20	C.1.1 Proposer Minimum Qualifications	106	If minimum client requirements are met with two of the references, will ETF consider eliminating the employer count requirement on the third?
A20			Yes. ETF will need to be comfortable that the employer base is sufficiently large to prove that the vendor can develop, manage, and deliver a roll out plan to its 1,500 employers.
Q21	C.6.1.6 Phasing the Project	202	Do you expect a phased rollout to Employers of the new Employer Reporting interface?
A21			We would assume that the rollout to employers would be a big-bang since all employers will be moving to a monthly (or pay-period)-based reporting, but we are open to properly justified alternatives
Q22	C.1.1	106	<p>We request the following changes [regarding the proposer minimum qualifications]:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) "multi-employer, public employee retirement system in the United States or Canada" to "Defined Contribution/Defined Benefit system in the United States or Canada" 2) "800 employers that include a cross-section of employer types, e.g., school districts, municipalities, cities, etc." to "800 employers/plan sponsors that include a cross-section of employer types" 3) "Multiple defined benefit plans" to "Multiple defined benefit/defined contribution plans" 4) "At least one insurance program" to "At least one referenced system with an insurance program"

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A22			<p>ETF issued a clarification to C.1 in which we pointed out our use of the word “may” in our discussion of rejection of qualifications.</p> <p>In response to the above:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) ETF does not want to relax the requirement that at least one reference must have multiple employers, preferably of different type. Further, experience in the public sector is imperative 2) We do not understand the difference between an employer and a plan sponsor and are therefore unable to answer this question 3) ETF does not require that all references be solely DB plans. However, a vendor must demonstrate at least one reference with a DB plan 4) If the question means that the vendor has no experience with an insurance program, having merely worked at a client who themselves had an insurance program, we cannot accept this suggested change. We suggest the vendor clarify the question and resubmit.
Q23	A.2.4 Clarifications and Specifications of Requirements	8	Would ETF consider a second round of Q&A?
A23			Yes, see A2
Q24	A.3.6	17	Please clarify if the estimated project budget is intended to cover costs only through the warranty year or through 10 years post warranty or through some other duration.
A24			Only through the warranty year – see Q&A 5
Q25	B.1.3.3.3.1- B.1.3.3.3.11 General Benefits Administration	57	Can ETF please confirm which of the application software systems listed in this section ETF is looking to have replaced, which EFT (sic) is looking to keep and have integrated with the BAS, and which are information only?

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A25			<p>ETF is looking for the BAS to replace all of the systems listed in B.1.3.3.3.1-B.1.3.3.3.11 except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.1.3.3.3.7 – Life Insurance Systems (MLIC) to which the BAS should interface • B.1.3.3.3.10 – Purchased systems with which the BAS should interface (or not) as appropriate – except Forecaster which will be replaced as part of the FMIS project
Q26	B.1.3.3.3 Application Software	61	Does ETF have any business drivers or other preference on which systems they would like implemented/replaced first?
A26			No
Q27	B.1.3.3.3.3 Member Information Tracking System	63	Please confirm ETF is looking to have CallSS replaced. Also, how does CallSS currently initiate a workflow process?
A27			<p>The capability within CallSS should be an integral part of the BAS solution. Therefore, yes, ETF is looking to replace CallSS.</p> <p>When an agent initiates a service request within CallSS, the programmatic interface between CallSS and Step2000 creates a workflow process that, depending on the priority of the request is immediately initiated or placed in a queue to be initiated via a batch process that evening</p>
Q28	B.1.3.3.3.5 Health Insurance Systems	64	Currently, is duplicative data stored for member/dependent demographics, or any other information, between WEBS and My ETF Benefits, or does one system act as the master and the systems are integrated to share/update this data?
A28			The data is duplicative – and sometimes different – and some WEBS processes do initiate an update of the myETFBenefits database, but others do not. This is part of reason for the DI project described in the RFP.
Q29	B.1.3.3.3.7 Life Insurance Systems	65	How does MLIC integrate with the current ETF systems?

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A29			MLIC has limited read/write access to several of ETF's legacy systems (WEBS, Step2000, and FRED), receives monthly electronic annuitant deduction and annual earnings files from ETF, and transmits annual annuitant files to ETF. Finally, ETF has limited read/write access to MLIC's State of Wisconsin database and "Life Benefits Extra (LBE)"
Q30	B.1.3.3.5 Physical Room (Data Center)	69	Please clarify if ETF envisions server infrastructure for the BAS system located at ETF and/or at DET and how EFT (sic) envisions the integration between these locations.
A30			ETF currently expects the server infrastructure to be located at DET. Both sites are on the state WAN and are connected with fiber. There are currently no connectivity issues and ETF expects none in future
Q31	B.1.3.3.5 Physical Room (Data Center)	69	Does ETF have a DR facility they intend to use for the new BAS?
A31			Please refer to Section B.1.3.3.5. However, the vendor is responsible for specification of the hardware and software configuration for the DR site.
Q32	B.1.3.4 Employer Reporting Sub-System (ERS)	69	Please confirm all subsystems and functionality in this section ETF seeks to replace.
A32			ETF confirms that they want to replace all subsystems and functionality listed in B.1.3.4
Q33	B.1.3.4.1 Business Functionality	70	Please clarify how ETF would like this process to work in the future. Does ETF envision getting employers to report information on their individual employees more often than annually thus simplifying the annual balancing challenge?
A33			ETF will require that employers report at least monthly. They should be able to opt to report monthly or possibly more often (e.g., per pay period) – at their discretion. See the requirements expressed in Appendix E.4.1.12
Q34	B.1.3.5 Financial Management Information System	71	Please confirm that ETF is not looking for vendors to replace functionality from this section.

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A34			ETF has a project underway (Section B.1.6.3) to replace its current FMIS. ETF expects the BAS to integrate tightly with the new FMIS with the appropriate functions in either the BAS or the FMIS based in part on the BAS vendor's experience-based advice
Q35	B.1.3.8 Web Subsystem	90	Please confirm ETF seeks the vendor to replace this web sub-system with member self-service functionality per the requirements. Or, does ETF seek to maintain its current website and have the new BAS pass it information?
A35			ETF seeks to replace the web sub-system described in B.1.3.8. Our expectation is that the BAS will provide a single BAS engine that will be accessible by people in various roles (user, member, employer, TPA), each able to access those functions to which they have rights but under a consistent brand, look, and feel. We believe that would require replacing the current web sub-system.
Q36	B.1.4.1 Current System Interfaces – Internal to ETF	94	Please confirm ETF is looking to replace Oracle Call Center Anywhere as part of the BAS implementation.
A36			ETF is NOT seeking a replacement of CCA at this time. Instead, the BAS is to integrate to the CCA as appropriate
Q37	B.1.4.2 Interfaces with External Partners	94	How many employers report electronically? Do all employers report electronically? If not, please confirm what percentage and what other methods of reporting are used. How many different electronic file layouts are used for employer reporting?
A37			Please refer to Appendix E.6 for a list of employers and their means of reporting. Those that do not use one of the two or three electronic file layouts currently report on paper – from which ETF staff perform manual data entry. Our goal is to achieve 100% electronic submission, making all employers responsible for the entry of their data
Q38	B.1.6 Projects Currently Underway	98	Please explain what expectations EFT (sic) has for each of these projects' impact on the BAS project.

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A38			<p>As indicated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. EBM is gathering the current business rules under which the BAS is to operate 2. DI is cleansing the data that will be converted to the BAS – as more completely described in Section C.7.1 3. FMIS is replacing the current financial subsystem and will integrate with the BAS – see Q&A 6 4. ACD will have no impact on the initial BAS project 5. Since the LMS has not yet been defined or selected, it is impossible to define the impact, if any, on the BAS 6. On-Line Voting is expected to have no impact on the BAS 7. AcSL will have no impact on the BAS project other than to set a high level of user expectation for the BAS’ capabilities; it will need to be replaced as part of the BAS requirements 8. Act 32 is expected to have no impact beyond those requirements that are already codified into Appendix E.4 9. Annual Processing will have an impact in terms of planning for and execution of the cut-over from the legacy system to BAS 10. Imaging of Employer Files will have no impact on the BAS other than to increase the number of images to be migrated from Content Manager to a new image archive 11. The Smoking Surcharge legislation has been vetoed and will not be enacted during this budget year
Q39	B.1.6.8 ACT 32 Impact Analysis and Compliance	102	<p>Does ETF expect any rule changes to be impacted on the BAS project based on the Act32 Analysis? If so, when will that analysis be completed? Can the vendors assume that the initial rules defined during the implementation will include any Act32 impact?</p>
A39			<p>Vendors can so assume. ETF believes we have captured the requirements to meet Act32 in Appendix E.4 of the RFP</p>

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
Q40	C.1.1 Proposer Minimum Qualifications	106	While “ <i>public pension funds with 100,000 lives</i> ” is clearly a critical minimum qualification characteristic across any reference, it might not be critical to have all of the remaining three characteristics (800 employers, multiple DB plans and an insurance plan) in all of one’s three minimum qualifications references provided that all of them are represented amongst the three references. Would ETF consider amending this requirement such that the minimum qualification is met by citing three client references that are public pension funds with over 100,000 lives who each meet at least one of the remaining three minimum qualification characteristics providing that each minimum qualification characteristic is met by at least one of the references?
A40			ETF believes that no RFP amendment is necessary, as we have clarified this question by providing the enclosed answers to this and similar questions (see A7).
Q41	C.1.2 Project Manager Minimum Qualifications	107	While “ <i>number of employers</i> ” is clearly a key qualification, it is unclear if at a certain point the specific number is critical and might not instead serve to limit potentially highly qualified PM’s. To this end, would ETC consider amending the Project Manager minimum requirements as follows: from “ <i>two (2) years of work similar in scope to that outlined in Part C of this RFP with a public retirement system providing a defined benefit plan, having at least 800 employers, and having a membership of at least 100,000 members and annuitants.</i> ” to “ <i>two (2) years of work similar in scope to that outlined in Part C of this RFP with a public retirement system providing a defined benefit plan, having at least 400 employers, and having a membership of at least 100,000 members and annuitants</i> ”?
A41			ETF believes that no RFP amendment is necessary. While ETF will consider responses that don’t meet ETF’s specifications, vendor scoring may be affected by the vendor’s proposed staffing model.
Q42	C.1.3 Project Team Minimum Qualifications	107	The requirement stated is for each key staff to have three references from different projects. Many of these projects are multi-year engagements. Can ETF allow multiple references from the same client to account for key personnel who may have worked all of their years on the same engagement?

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A42			ETF would prefer to spread the references over multiple clients. However, if a proposed member of staff has worked only at a single client, the references must obviously all come from that client.
Q43	C.2.1 Nature of Desired Solution	109	To meet the coverage for 10 years after warranty does ETF expect vendors to propose hardware refreshes as it is unlikely the infrastructure initially implemented will last 14 years?
A43			Payment for the hardware refreshes would be the responsibility of the hosting site (ETF/DET or the host selected through Option 2), not the BAS vendor. However, ETF would appreciate vendor-provided awareness of the recommended refresh rate as it would make the response more complete
Q44	C.4.3 Specific Information about this Portion of the RFP	141	How would ETF like vendors to respond for configurations that need to be made by a technical resource? These would not be enhancements to the product, rather these would be “configurations” of functionality included in the base product such as calculations, batches, reports and other items made by a technical resource without changes to the actual base product. Please confirm if these should be coded as Compliant?
A44			ETF believes that configuration includes changes to parameters, tables, templates, etc., as opposed to changes to base solution code. The items that fall into these categories should be coded as compliant.
Q45	C.5.4.1 ETF'S Hardware and Software Standards	157	Please provide the Strategic technology for SAN Replication in Table 31.
A45			EMC VMax
Q46	C.5.4.1 ETF'S Hardware and Software Standards	158	Red Hat Linux is described as an acceptable operating system platform for BAS but it is not listed in section C.5.4.1 ETF'S HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE STANDARDS. Is Red Hat Enterprise Linux 6.x an acceptable operating system platform for BAS?
A46			Yes. Please refer to Sections B.1.3.3.2.1 and C.5.6.4
Q47	C.5.5.1 Hardware (Introduction)	164	Is ETF expecting the vendor to include specifications and estimated costs for UPS, cooling, equipment racks?
A47			UPS and cooling – No. Equipment racks, yes, as indicated in Section D.1.2, Schedule 1, on page 318 of the RFP

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
Q48	C.5.5.1 Hardware (Introduction)	164	Is ETF expecting the vendor to include specifications and estimated costs for network devices such as firewall, switching equipment, load balancing devices, etc.?
A48			Yes, as indicated in Section D.1.2, Schedule 1, on page 318 of the RFP
Q49	C.5.5.4 Storage	165	Is ETF expecting the vendor to include estimated costs for SAN and related storage components (SAN switches, Path management, SAN fabric management, etc.?)
A49			No. However, the vendor is expected to discuss the amount of disk space required for their solution. See C.5.2 page 153 and C.5.5.2
Q50	C.5.6.1 Overall Software Requirements	166	In this section EFT (sic) specifies that <i>“The proposal must include a complete inventory of all software complete with specifications and licensing fees.”</i> However in C.5.5.1 - HARDWARE (INTRODUCTION) on page 164 the inclusion of fees or costs are not specified. Is ETF expecting the vendor to provide estimated hardware costs for BAS if the vendors recommended hardware complies with ETF’s Hardware and Software Standards as defined in section C.5.4.1?
A50			Yes, as indicated in Section D.1.2, Schedule 1, on page 318 of the RFP
Q51	C.5.6.1 Overall Software Requirements	166	The ETF RFP states the following: <i>“In addition, the source code for any third party software not covered by the preceding paragraph that is delivered and/or licensed to ETF as part of the new solution must be escrowed on ETF’s behalf.”</i> Source code for Third-party software such operating system software or database management software is normally not available to the purchaser or the licensee. How does ETF expect the vendor to meet this requirement?
A51			The vendor should note in their response the third-party commodity software such as operating systems or database management software for which it is not possible to obtain the source code
Q52	C.5.7 Installation and Configuration	177	There are two entries in the Vendor column that are delineated with an asterisk (*) but there appears to be no accompanying explanation or footnote. Can ETF please provide the reasons for the asterisk next to Helpdesk Software and Web Application Firewall?
A52			Our typist has fat fingers. Please ignore the asterisks

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
Q53	C.9.3	188	To ensure all vendors propose similar efforts, can ETF please specify how many hours of support it seeks in each year for post-production support?
A53			<p>ETF has no basis for specifying the necessary number of hours of annual support. The vendor must respond based on their experience – and justify same. If there is a wide variation among vendor responses, ETF will seek clarification – and since the vendor will also supply the per-hour cost of such support as part of their Cost Proposal, the normalization of the amount is an arithmetical operation.</p> <p>We recognize that different vendors will have different ideas of what the appropriate amount of support entails – and that their projected costs may therefore vary considerably. We are interested in understanding the vendor rationalizations for different amounts of support – and suggest the vendor document the assumption under which they arrive at the estimate they do of the number of hours of support that are needed. However, since we are also seeking an apples-to-apples comparison across vendors, we suggest that the score may be done by applying the vendor-supplied hourly rate against a constant (across all vendors) number of hours</p>
Q54	Business Summary and Schedule 3		Should vendors add a column for Year 4 if the proposed plan takes more than 36 months before the final go-live? Where should these costs be entered so that the Warranty year is maintained? Can ETF clarify any expectations it may have as to project timeline? Should vendors infer from the cost grids the ETF expects a project timeline of less than 36 months or less?
A54			<p>Yes, vendors should add a column for Year 4 if it is warranted.</p> <p>Should the project take all or part of a fourth year to complete, the warranty year would still be the 12 month period following final roll out.</p> <p>ETF has no specific expectations for the project timeline – other than our need to implement a solution in a timely fashion</p> <p>Based on the cost grid provided, vendors should infer only that it was convenient to fit 3 project years and a warranty year onto the spreadsheet.</p>
Q55	Cost Schedule 1 and 2		Should vendors add columns for years 1-10 after warranty to include ongoing estimated costs?

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A55			If the vendor feels that it would clarify their presentation of information to add columns for years 1-10 after warranty, please do so. Note that only the costs from Schedule 2V get incorporated into the single fixed cost for the project
Q56			Is a vendor allowed to respond to this procurement if they're already currently working with ETF on another implementation or have completed another implementation in the recent past?
A56			Yes, however, ETF has taken legal steps to ensure that a firewall exists between any current or recently completed project and the BAS project. Vendors currently working with ETF on another project or in another capacity are permitted to respond to this RFP
Q57	A.2.4, Clarification of the Specifications and Requirements	8	Because of the complexity of the systems and processes required and to ensure that we clearly understand ETF's expectations, would ETF consider allowing a second round of questions before the distribution of the question responses deadline?
A57			Yes, see Q&A 2
Q58	A.2.23, Criminal Background Verification	14	<p>This requirement asks for details regarding the vendor's background check procedures.</p> <p>Should this detail be provided to ETF after contract award at the time the background checks are conducted?</p> <p>If not, when should the vendor provide this information?</p> <p>If in our proposal, in which proposal section does ETF expect this information to appear?</p>
A58			Should ETF request this information from the vendor, the request would be made after contract award.
Q59	A.3.7, Invoicing, Payments, Holdbacks, and Tracking Thereof and D.1, Format of Vendor Proposals	19 and 302	<p>RFP Section A.3.7 states, "All prices quoted must be good for a period of 180 days after the submission due date to ETF". However, RFP Section D.1 states, "The proposal must remain valid for at least one year from the proposal receipt deadline".</p> <p>Please clarify how long our Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal must be valid?</p>
A59			One year; please alter form 3261 to reflect the longer term

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
Q60	C.1.1, Proposer Minimum Qualifications and F.5, Vendor Client Reference Form	106 and 752	<p>This requirement states, "For all references, include the site name, the name/title/..."</p> <p>Does "site name" in this instance refer to "Project Name" included in the Vendor Client Reference Form (F.5)?</p>
A60			<p>ETF notes that some clients may operate from multiple locations. Should that be the case, in addition to the Project/Client Name, please also supply the specific site or location (as appropriate)</p>
Q61	C.2.1, Nature of Desired Solution and C.5.8.2, Scalability Requirements	110-111 and 182	<p>The RFP specifically calls for a 1-year warranty. The requirement to provide an additional 10 years of no-cost support and scalability is equivalent to a supplemental warranty obligation. During the post-warranty period, ETF would have the option of procuring standard application and hardware support services.</p> <p>Would ETF agree to remove the requirement to provide no-cost error correction support services and no-cost system scalability, for a period of 10 years after the end of the warranty period?</p>
A61			<p>ETF has no intent of requiring 10 years of no-cost support and scalability. Further, we have no intention of requiring no-cost error correction support services. ETF requires that a vendor appropriately size the proposed system to meet our requirements for growth and scalability as already expressed in the RFP for a ten year period following the final go-live date.</p>
Q62	C.2.2.17 Appropriately Exploit Existing And Emerging Enabling Technologies	127	<p>Although not required, the RFP cites the desire of an optional data warehouse in a future state.</p> <p>Please confirm that vendors should include the cost for services as well as maintenance and support in Schedule 11? If not, where should these costs appear?</p>
A62			<p>Schedule 11 and Tab C-10 would be an excellent location in which to describe a vendor's contributions to a future state.</p>

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
Q63	D.1, Format of Vendor Proposals	301	<p>This requirement states: "All proposals are to be in single-column format and page-numbered from first page to last, with the permitted exception of attachments to the proposal."</p> <p>Does ETF wish for sections to be numbered consecutively within the tabbed areas or should vendors number consecutively from beginning to end (with the exception of attachments, inserted letters/forms, and those items that are pre-numbered)?</p>
A63			Section D.1.1 specifies the numbering of the tabs in the vendor response and the format for the numbering thereof in response to the RFP sections.
Q64	D.1, Format of Vendor Proposals	302	Is it permissible for vendors to submit documents not available in Microsoft Office format in Adobe PDF format only (e.g., audited financial statements, insurance documentation, certifications, signed forms/letters, etc.)?
A64			Yes, however, the PDF documents <u>must</u> be indexed to support full text search
Q65	D.1, Format of Vendor Proposals	302	Please confirm that each vendor's technical CD should contain one folder with native files (Word, Excel, etc.) of the technical proposal and one folder with PDF files of the redacted technical proposal.
A65			ETF does not specify the format of the redacted technical proposal; however, the suggested format of the CD sounds reasonable
Q66	D.1.1, Technical Proposal Format (Figure 17)	303	Can vendors assume they should just ignore the line in Figure 17 that includes "Name of Authorized Company Representative, Title, Phone"?
A66			Yes
Q67	D.1.1, Technical Proposal Format (Figure 17) and Tab B – Vendor Information	303 and 307	<p>RFP Figure 17 includes B-1, General Information but there is no requirements listed on page 307 for this section.</p> <p>Are there requirements missing or does ETF expect this section to be left blank?</p>

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A67			No response is required in Tab B-1. However, the vendor is expected to provide a response in the sub-sections, B-1.1, B-1.2, etc.
Q68	D.1.1, Technical Proposal Format (Figure 17) and Tab D – Attachments (D-9)	305 and 314	RFP Figure 17 lists D-9 as Concept of Operations – Table of Contents. However, on page 314, Attachment D-9 is titled Concept of Operations Sample Document. Does ETF expect vendors to provide a Table of Contents for a Concept of Operations Sample Document or an actual document?
A68			As noted in Section C.6.2.2, ETF requires vendors to provide a sample Concept of Operations document as part of their response
Q69	D.1.1, Technical Proposal Format Tab B – Vendor Information (B-1.5) and E.2.2, Deviation and Exception	309 and 355	RFP Section D.1.1 (B-1.5) directs vendors to include all exceptions to the Terms and Conditions (defined in RFP Section A.3 to include A.3, E.2, and E.3) within proposal section B-1.5. However, RFP Section E.2.2 directs vendors to include a signed letter attached to the request. Please clarify that vendors are to follow the requirements of RFP Section D.1.1, B-1.5 only.
A69			Please follow the requirements of RFP, Section D.1.1, B-1.5 only
Q70	D.1.1, Technical Proposal Format Tab B – Vendor Information (B-2.2)	311	Given the length of our audited financial statements, and those of our subcontractors, can vendors provide these documents in electronic format only?
A70			Yes, but the PDFs must be indexed to support full text search
Q71	E.3.3, Disclosure or Independence and Relationship and F.1, Proposal Cover Sheet	342 and 747	This requirement states, “Prior to award of any contract, a potential contractor shall certify in writing to the procuring agency that no...” RFP Section F.1 (last paragraph) contains similar language. By signing F.1 Proposal Cover Page and including this form with the proposal, will vendors meet the requirements of RFP Section E.3.3? If not, where in our proposal should we include the response to RFP Section E.3.3?

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A71			By signing and including F.1 Proposal Cover Page, vendors meet the requirements
Q72	E.7, ETF Servers and E.8, ETF Printers	641 – 648 and 649 – 652	These sections were not noted as being redacted like the items on RFP pages 57 and 92. Please confirm that these two sections are redacted as well and not missing content.
A72			Tables 87 Servers (on page 641) and 88 Printers (on page 649), were indicated as having been redacted. The material to fill those tables will be supplied to vendors who sign and submit an NDA.
Q73	Cost Proposal Worksheet	Bid Summary Tab	Please clarify what is intended to be included (what will roll up to) cell G.12 (Total – Functional amount for Out Year) in this worksheet.
A73			As currently structured, the quantity in cell G-12 should remain \$0.00. The Out Year column is included in order to present the costs for Mandatory Options 2 and 3.
Q74	Cost Proposal Worksheet	Bid Summary Tab	The column titled “Out Year Period” includes (Contract Years 5-13). Should this reference be (Contract Years 4-13)?
A74			As indicated on Schedule 5, the Warranty Year is assumed to be Year 4, and subsequent years to be Years 5-13. If the vendor’s proposed implementation schedule does not fit the template, they are encouraged to change it to fit
Q75	A.2.4	8	Would EFT (sic) allow a second round of questions and answers in the late July timeframe?
A75			Yes, see Q&A 2
Q76	A.3.6	17	How will Schedule 10 be factored into the procurement scoring?
A76			The Total Cost of items included in Schedule 10 will be combined with the Total - Functional Cost on the Bid Summary to arrive at a cost score. See the amended descriptions of the ETF Bid Summary on page 317 and Schedule 10 on page 320 of the RFP
Q77	A.3.7	18	Milestone based payments mean the vendor is going substantial periods without a payment. Will ETF lower the retainage amount to 8%?
A77			The retainage percentage is non-negotiable. However, ETF would be open to the payment of a regular monthly carrying amount. However, the primary payment amounts must be reserved for deliverables as noted

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
Q78	A.3.7	18	Is the retainage amount negotiable and can vendors make assumptions about a different retainage amount?
A78			No, see A77
Q79	NA	NA	Vendors currently providing financial and actuarial services to EFT [sic] may have a conflict of interest in bidding and providing services under this procurement. Are such vendors conflicted out?
A79			ETF believes that we have appropriately protected ourselves – and those vendors – from any potential conflict of interest and therefore such vendors would be eligible to submit a proposal
Q80	NA	NA	Other retirement systems that have released RFP's have allowed for an "inspection day" providing vendors an opportunity to gain further insight into the technical and business environment. Other vendors are currently engaged at ETF on other projects and have access to information that may not be provided as part of this procurement. Would ETF be willing to allow vendors to attend a confidential, in person session to the [sic] have the opportunity to present specific questions to ETF?
A80			No
Q81	F.1 Proposal Cover Page (DOA 3261)	747	Proposal due date is listed as TBD. What should it say?
A81			August 27, 2013 RFP Proposals Due at 2:00 PM CDT. 801 W Badger Road, Madison
Q82	Bidder Conference		How is the RFP structured around using software? What is ETF's willingness to allow the software vendor and software processes to drive the processes rather than having the software change to reflect the current processes?
A82			ETF is looking to the vendor to provide us best practices. We will adapt wherever possible. If there are compelling reasons we have to do something in a certain manner, we'll have to make a modification. We are very serious about minimizing the number of customizations. We want a solution that is easily upgradable and maintainable. That said, we recognize that some customization may be required.
Q83	Bidder Conference		What is ETF's openness to the use of a vendor's forms?

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A83			The answer to this is based on the same principle as above. We want the best solution with the least necessary change by way of customization. And we also believe that forms will eventually become less important as self-service becomes the primary means of interaction. We will adapt
Q84	Bidder Conference		ETF is implementing an FMIS. What are ETF's expectations with respect to the services provided by the FMIS and those provided by the BAS?
A84			<p>We are implementing PeopleSoft, the system on which the state has standardized. We are the first agency in the state to implement PeopleSoft's GL, AP, and AR functions. We do a lot of pass-through and exchanging of financial information with our employers, TPAs, and the retirement system. We envision the FMIS working as a hub and anticipate that the new payroll system will directly feed the financial system.</p> <p>A result of agency growth over the years is a significant increase in the number of handoffs. We expect the FMIS implementation (and the BAS) to decrease the handoffs and also to have an organizational impact. We are trying to assure people that we don't have a picture of how the future will look but we are trying to do as much education as we can.</p>
Q85	Bidder Conference		The RFP is open on whether you want an on-site or SAAS solution. As an organization, do you have a view of some of the pros and cons?
A85			We are open to alternative hosting options.. We do not anticipate having our own data center in the new building. DET has a state of the art data center that is clearly underutilized. However, we are willing and open to listen to suggestions, and suggest that vendors expand upon the benefits and issues with a possible SAAS solution in the context of Option 2.
Q86	Bidder Conference		The RFP is requesting that the key staff have three references from three different clients. This seems to suggest that you would get scored less well if you think about who you staffed for the job. Are they thinking of scoring a person higher who worked a year across three one-year jobs versus someone who has worked five years at one job?

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A86			We worded the questions the way we did so that we might get a vendor's best possible Team. We also believe that the experience a staff member has in working with other members of the proposed team is important. We want the best combination of people and team.
Q87	Bidder Conference		What is ETF's definition of support and can ETF quantify the amount needed?
A87			See the expanded answer supplied to Q53
Q88	Bidder Conference		The cost proposal will be opened after the technical proposal. How then will ETF evaluate Schedule 10 which states what is not being delivered for the budgeted amount?
A88			ETF points out that Section A.3.6 clearly states that the vendor is to "... clearly disclose in Section B-1.3 of their technical proposal any of ETF's requirements or functionality that will be omitted from their proposed solution in their effort to meet ETF's BAS Project Budget." Schedule 10 is to be used <u>only</u> to associate a cost with each omitted item. The technical evaluation of a vendor's proposed solution (other than cost) will be based on the material provided in Section B-1.3 of their response.
Q89	Bidder Conference		How is Schedule 10 going to be scored?
A89			See A76, but also note that Section B-1.3 of the response should enumerate and fully describe those items that are not being provided under budget limitations under Section A.3.6 of the RFP
Q90	Bidder Conference		There are three columns at the right of the functionality tables, Included, Requires Customization, and Not Available. Would checking boxes other than "Included" have an effect on the contents or scoring of Schedule 10?
A90			If the reason for checking the Not Available box in any of the "Ability To" matrices is due to budgetary limitations, that exclusion should be described in Section B-1.3 of the vendor response and the cost associated with the item excluded should be listed in Schedule 10.
Q91	Bidder Conference		If you have checked something under customization, should you have a corresponding item in the Schedule 10?

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A91			Not necessarily. The assumption is that if you indicated that you would supply a certain feature through customization of your product, the price for performing that customization is included in the base budget; if you chose not to include the feature, the exclusion would be described in Tab B-1.3 and costed in Schedule 10.
Q92	Bidder Conference		Can you clarify ETF's thoughts on replacing or not replacing Content Manager?
A92			The reason it is a mandatory option is that we wanted to be flexible based on what the vendor brings to the table. If part of the solution captures the workflow, then changing CM is something we should do to make the solution better. We do currently use Content Manager; all of our images are in DB2. There are certainly some budgetary limitations using the viewer. And we do not want to be in a situation where we would have images stored in two (or more) different places.
Q93	Bidder Conference		Are there images in the system that will not be a part of BAS?
A93			No
Q94	Bidder Conference		Please clarify that the default response to the RFP is to replace CM and the option is to retain it.
A94			Correct.
Q95	A.1.4 Project Objectives and Scope	5	Please clarify on the "conversion and porting of ETF data" on Page 5. Please confirm that ETF will be responsible for extracting legacy data into an agreed upon format, and that it is the vendor's responsibility to load the data into the BAS database
A95			ETF so confirms
Q96	C.2.2.1 Image Documents On Receipt	113	Please elaborate on ETF security standards. Is there any person/entity information stored outside ETF's current LDAP infrastructure that is used for authentication/authorization?

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A96			<p>Yes. Personal information such as SSN, Member ID, and Birth Date, stored in DB2 tables, are used by some applications for authentication. Several applications use additional DB2 tables for application specific authorizations. We expect this non-LDAP authentication/authorization infrastructure to be replaced with similar functionality within the BAS.</p> <p>In addition, we have DOA/DET RACF (Resource Access Control Facility) security used with ETF mainframe systems.</p>
Q97	C.2.2.8 Ensure Application of Enhanced System Security Principles	117	<p>Will ETF consider releasing, under the confidential agreement, the current security policies and procedures, so that the vendor can have an idea of how to propose security tools that monitor compliance with the said policies and procedures? Does ETF currently use in-house tools that monitor compliance with ETF's security policies and procedures?</p> <p>With respect to the following requirement: "The solution should provide auto-encryption of emails going outside the organization to ensure compliance with HIPAA regulations " Please clarify if the above requirement applies only to emails containing information governed by HIPAA regulations, or all emails to members, employers, and third parties.</p>
A97			<p>Ad hoc audits, custom queries and reports, and logging are used to monitor compliance.</p> <p>All email containing personally identifiable information, including, but not limited to, HIPAA covered data, must be encrypted when going outside the organization. ETF currently uses the Cisco IronPort product for this.</p>
Q98	C.2.2.8 Ensure Application of Enhanced Security Principles	118	<p>Does ETF currently have a tool to provide auto-encryption of emails leaving the organization, If yes; Can details on this configuration be provided?</p>
A98			<p>Yes, ETF uses the Cisco IronPort product, including the PII and HIPAA dictionaries to identify emails that must be encrypted. If more information is necessary, please ask a more specific question.</p>
Q99	C.2.2.17 Appropriately Exploit Existing and Emerging Enabling Technologies	128	<p>Please clarify on the "Remote Workstation Support" on Page 128. Please specify the scope of remote workstation support. Is it expected that the remote support and access includes the ability to "remotely" log in to members, agencies and third parties using remote desktop support tools?</p>

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A99			The vendor is referred to the first bolded sentence at the top of page 112 of the RFP noting that C.2.2.17 is not a specific business requirement. That said, should an ETF customer permit such remote support, ETF believes that it is a best practice to support it.
Q100	C.5.4.2 User Interface Standards	160	Please clarify on page 160 what is meant by “must be universally designed to support all users.”
A100			“Universal design” is the phrase now in use for all features that have previously been collected under the “handicapped accessible” rubric.
Q101	C.5.6.4.2 LDAP Authentication/ Authorization	170	Does ETF have any solution currently to synchronize Novell eDirectory and Active Directory identities?
A101			ETF does not have a product for, nor does it wish to synchronize, different LDAPs such as AD and eDirectory. We are asking the vendor to describe how their application works when it is simultaneously connected to two different LDAPs to authenticate different types of users (staff, employer, member, etc.) ETF expects the BAS to simultaneously use the DET-supported Tools4Ever product with Microsoft Active Directory for staff Access, and to use Novell's eDirectory for employer, TPA, and member.
Q102	C.5.6.5 System Software Tools	171	Please clarify the reference to distributed Control-M means that Control-M is currently the scheduling tool used for Windows based hosts.
A102			Control-M is an enterprise batch scheduling tool that provides fully integrated scheduling for Windows, Linux, and mainframe hosts.
Q103	C.5.6.5.2 Programmer and User Productivity Tools	172	Please clarify that the statement “Ability to auto-capture errors in production and auto log to the incident management tool” refers to the trapping of production errors and that it is ETF's desire to create tickets in the help desk system without review by ETF staff.
A103			ETF would prefer a BAS system that automatically captures and reports production issues to the Help Desk and issue tracking system.
Q104	C.5.6.6 Security and Controls	173	Does ETF/State have any existing PKI or Digital Signature infrastructure deployed?

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A104			ETF uses a combination of Verisign, Microsoft, and IBM WebSphere PKI solutions. ETF functions as the Certificate Authority for the Microsoft and WebSphere technologies.
Q105	C.5.6.6 Security and Controls	173	What type of encryption tools does ETF currently have for data at rest and in motion for BAS?
A105			ETF has no encryption tool for data at rest for application or database use. ETF uses disk encryption software for laptop hard drives. For encryption in motion, ETF uses SSL and SFTP. Commercial and internal PKI are used for these solutions.
Q106	C.5.6.6 Security and Controls	174	Does ETF propose to use legacy system with SSO authentication? If not, then what's the purpose of SSO authentication? Please elaborate on desired support for multi-factor authentication for BAS access
A106			ETF would like SSO within the complete BAS solution. This means anything that is part of the BAS system, such as imaging, telephony, web, etc., would require one set of credentials. Legacy ETF systems that are being replaced would be out of scope for SSO. The BAS must be capable of working in conjunction with a multi-factor authentication system such as RSA SecurID for administrative and possibly internal user access, as well as provide a cost effective multi-factor authentication solution for member access.
Q107	C.5.8.7 Security Considerations	184	Please provide details on the QRadar tool to be integrated for BAS in terms of how many environments the tool is deployed in and storage capacity.
A107			QRadar functions as ETF's SIEM and log management product. The BAS system must provide system/OS and application logs to QRadar in predefined formats. This will be required in all environments (development, acceptance, production, etc.) and may require some log collection components in different environments depending on the solution.
Q108	C.5.8.7 Security Considerations	184	Does ETF have tools for real-time database monitoring and data leakage prevention, please provide details?
A108			Currently, ETF is using custom scripts and queries for monitoring. QRadar does alert to several potential leakage situations.

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
Q109	C.7.1.1 Data Security	230	What type of obfuscation / data masking tools does ETF currently have?
A109			To date, ETF has used custom scripts to obfuscate PII data when moved into a development or test environment.
Q110	E.4.1.12 Employer Reporting	397	Please provide additional detail related to parameters that dictate the allocation of service based on a member's reported number of hours worked during a reporting period.
A110			We suggest that this is but one of many business rules related to allocation of service. See the scenario for "Employer Remits Retirement Contribution" in Appendix E.21
Q111	E.4.1.12 Employer Reporting	397	Requirement 27 refers to reported days while previous requirements in this section have referred to reported hours. Does ETF accept both reported days and reported hours in relation to monthly employer reports?
A111			Yes, though to date employers have reported only annually
Q112	E.4.1.13 Enrollment	409	Once a member is enrolled in either a health, life, or other insurance benefit plan, should they have access to make changes to that plan at any point in time via the web portal or should changes only be allowed during the open enrollment period?
A112			Depending on the benefit program and the data item being altered, members should be able to make changes at any time not just during the open enrollment period
Q113	E.4.1.13 Enrollment	409	ETF mentions that it currently captures demographic information from third parties (such as insurance providers, employers, NCOA, etc.) and updates internal records accordingly. Please provide some additional insight into the priority that is given to each of these services when determining the most up-to-date demographic information in the current system.
A113			Unfortunately, such priorities have not been defined. The rules by which updates are done to other data elements do not exist.
Q114	E.23 ETF Web Services Security Requirements	726	Does ETF currently have any tools that provide for web services security?

RFP ETC0003 CONFIDENTIAL VENDOR Q & A, VERSION 20130709

NBR	RFP SECTION	RFP PAGE	QUESTIONS
A114			ETF uses security certificates for web services security.