

**RFP 2020-04 – Healthcare Evidence Initiative 2.0  
Questions and Answers**

#	Question	Response
1.	<p><b>RFP Section 1.10.2 Format of Proposals, pg. 7</b></p> <p>The RFP states " Use a Times New Roman, Arial, or Calibri font of at least 12-point size throughout unless a form is required by Covered California that contains a smaller font." Can vendors use a smaller font in graphics and tables?</p>	<p>Yes, bidders may use a smaller font in graphics and tables.</p>
2.	<p><b>RFP Section 1.10.2 Format of Proposals, pg. 7</b></p> <p>The RFP states "Sequentially number the pages in each section and clearly identify each section in the order requested." Should vendors sequentially number the response throughout or does each section page numbering start at 1?</p>	<p>Bidders may either sequentially number the response throughout or begin each section's page numbering at 1.</p>
3.	<p><b>RFP Section 3.1 Format of Proposal Packages, pg. 15</b></p> <p>The RFP states "Proposals in response to this RFP must be divided into two appropriately labeled folders marked Technical Proposal and Administrative Requirements." Does this mean vendor should submit 2 separate files, one for Technical Proposal and one for Administrative Requirements or one overall document divided into two main volumes - Technical Proposal and Administrative Requirements?</p>	<p>Bidders may either submit two separate Technical Proposal and Administrative Requirements files or one overall document divided into two main volumes.</p>
4.	<p><b>Template B - Proposer Experience, Section 3.2 Financial Capacity, pg. 6</b></p> <p>Financial statements can be several hundred pages long, can vendor provide a link to the required financial statement information? If not, can vendor include as an attachment at the end of our response to avoid having this lengthy content in the middle of the response?</p>	<p>No links.</p> <p>Bidders may include financial statements as attachments at the end of their responses.</p>
5.	<p><b>Templates G, I and N</b></p> <p>Does vendor embed these files into the Technical Proposal section or can we include as separate files with response or at the end?</p>	<p>Bidders may either embed these files or include them as separate files with the response or at the end.</p>
6.	<p><b>RFP Section 5 Preference and Incentives, pg. 26</b></p> <p>If a vendor utilized a subcontractor that is both small business and DVBE will credit be given in both categories?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

**RFP 2020-04 – Healthcare Evidence Initiative 2.0  
Questions and Answers**

#	Question	Response
7.	<p><b>Template G, E Episodes Disease Severity, E.10</b></p> <p>Can Covered California provide more information on the type of bundled payment analytics they are interested in? Is it prospective (identifying services for bundling) or retrospective (evaluating prior bundled payment QHD initiatives)?</p>	<p>Covered California would use bundling analytics to identify standard bundled payment case types that would make the most sense for the Covered California population (prospective) and to determine the impact of bundled payments (retrospective).</p>
8.	<p><b>Template G – Functional, AG 1.12/ AG1.17</b></p> <p>Requirements AG1.12 and AG1.17 imply that duplicate data will be received and loaded to the Covered California HEI2 2.0, as well as forwarded on to OSHPD for inclusion in the HPD. These requirements drive duplicate work, redundant data and significant cost for Covered California. Can you provide Covered California's unique use case intended for the APCD-CDL™ formats being requested for HEI 2.0?</p>	<p>Duplicate data will not be received. Covered California anticipates that QHP Issuers submitting data to OSHPD HPD (no sooner than July 2023) may eventually object to submitting essentially the same data in two different formats to two different State of California agencies. If such a data supplier opts to use only the APCD-CDL™ format for submission to both agencies, Covered California requires its HEI 2.0 vendor to accommodate the data supplier.</p>
9.	<p><b>Template G – Functional, AN1.23, AN1.24, AG2.19</b></p> <p>These three requirements describe at least three separate environments that will house and use the HEI data. Can you share the unique use/cases that are planned for each of these versions of the data?</p>	<p>Covered California has attempted to describe two primary environments for which the HEI 2.0 vendor would be responsible: 1) the data warehouse database and querying tools, described by the vast majority of the RFP's functional requirements, and 2) the statistical analyses environment described by AN1.23.</p> <p>AN1.24 is intended to enable Covered California staff to access the first environment above via the AN1.23 statistical analyses environment. (There may also be opportunities to execute AN1.24 activity from Covered California's own servers, depending on data access routes proposed by bidders.)</p> <p>AN1.24 use case example: Covered California advanced user collaborates with HEI 2.0 vendor and an academic researcher to explore a new algorithm for risk prediction that needs to leverage claims data. The Covered California user may access/query/analyze the HEI 2.0 database tables directly through a pathway provided by the HEI 2.0 vendor, creating a temporary analytical file and extracting statistical results or a smaller analytical file to pass back to the Covered California server for subsequent sharing with a research collaborator.</p> <p>AG2.19 is intended to charge the HEI 2.0 vendor with periodically extracting and transmitting large data sets</p>

**RFP 2020-04 – Healthcare Evidence Initiative 2.0  
Questions and Answers**

#	Question	Response
		or database copies to Covered California. Covered California and not the HEI 2.0 vendor would be responsible for providing and maintaining the environment in which these data sets or database copies would reside.
10.	Is Covered California amenable to receiving proposals that target a subset of services identified in this Request for Proposal (RFP), awarding more than one contract in order to achieve a “best of breed” approach and optimize the opportunity to successfully meet the RFP’s full scope?	No, Covered California expects to award one contract as a result of this procurement.
11.	Has Covered California met with any vendors to develop the requirements in the RFP? If so, which vendors?	Covered California has not met with potential bidders to develop the requirements in this RFP.
12	Has Covered California seen their ideal solution implemented at another agency or agencies? If so, which agency or agencies?	Covered California has not seen its ideal solution implemented at another agency or agencies.
13	<b><u>Formatting &amp; Submission Questions</u></b> Section 1.10.1 Electronic Signatures (page 7) <b><u>QUESTION:</u></b> Is the PDF submission requirement only for signed documents and forms? If so, can all other non-Excel and non-redlined documents also be submitted as PDF?	Bidders need not limit PDF response content to documents containing signatures. They may submit other response content as PDF documents unless noted otherwise in RFP instructions.
14	Section 1.10.2.3 Narrative Format (page 7) <b><u>QUESTION:</u></b> Regarding page limits, the only section that notes any page limit is the 'Executive Summary' in Template A (page 1); "This section should be a brief (three- (3) to five- (5) page) summary...". Is this the only section with a page limitation?	Covered California believes this is the only portion of the bidder’s response with a page limit.
15	Section 3.1 Format of Proposal Packages (page 15) <b><u>QUESTION:</u></b> Since the submission of proposals will be via e-mail, folders are not allowed to be attached to an e-mail, only documents. How should we separate the 'Technical Proposal' from the 'Administrative Requirements'?	If bidders cannot attach folders to email, they may submit documents intended for separate folders via separate emails, or they may make clear in their emails which attachments are intended for which folders.
16	Section 3.1 Format of Proposal Packages (page 15) <b><u>QUESTION:</u></b> Can all of the sections in the 'Technical Proposal' (minus the Excel documents) be collated into one electronic document (as a PDF)? If yes, can page numbering be continuous since there appears to be no page limitations except for the 'Executive Summary'?	Yes, bidders may collate sections of the Technical Proposal into one electronic document. In that example, page numbering may either be continuous or restart at 1 in each section.

**RFP 2020-04 – Healthcare Evidence Initiative 2.0  
Questions and Answers**

#	Question	Response
17	<p>Template A, 2.0 Table of Contents (page 1) <b>QUESTION:</b> Since this is an electronic submission and many documents (including response forms and attachments) will need to be submitted separately, does the TOC still need to designate documents other than those in a collated Technical Proposal (assuming that collation of the Technical Proposal is allowed)?</p>	<p>The bidder's response Table of Contents should include all submitted content, even if particular contents are submitted separately.</p>
18	<p><b><u>Administrative Questions</u></b> Section 7. Model Contract (page 32): For the list of Exhibits, 2.f, there was no 'Exhibit C, Attachment 1 - Resumes' included in the downloaded documents. <b>QUESTION:</b> Since we are being asked to attach resumes of Key Project Staff within the Template F section, should we ignore this reference on page 32?</p>	<p>Covered California has added Model Contract Exhibit C, Attachment 1 – Resumes. (See RFP Addendum #1.) Please follow Template F instructions re: resumes for Key Project Staff. Following successful procurement, Covered California will incorporate the selected vendor's Key Project Staff resumes into the contract's Exhibit C, Attachment 1 – Resumes.</p>
19	<p><b><u>Staffing &amp; Support Questions</u></b> Exhibit A, Section F (page 11) <b>QUESTION:</b> Can Covered CA be more specific on the scope of services that must be performed on site at Covered California Headquarters?</p>	<p>Covered California has modified this language in Model Contract Exhibit A. (See RFP Addendum #1.) Bidders should use their best judgment to propose efficient staffing location models which enable them to satisfy Covered California's requirements.</p>
20	<p><b><u>Functional Questions</u></b> Template G - AG2.12 <b>QUESTION:</b> Can we assume that items (a) thru (e) will be provided in either primary data sets or secondary data sets? For example, to enable analysis and stratification of populations by the Federal Poverty Levels (FPL), we would need annual income of enrollees.</p>	<p>Yes, applicable data elements reside in the CalHEERS and QHP Issuer enrollment records provided to HEI. See Procurement Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “AG1.10 Spec Enr CC HEI v14 incl CalHEERS 20190925.pdf”,</li> <li>• “AG1.12 Standard HEI File Specs v9.07 20200309.pdf”, and</li> <li>• AG1.12 Anthem- and Kaiser-specific enrollment extract specifications.</li> </ul>

**RFP 2020-04 – Healthcare Evidence Initiative 2.0  
Questions and Answers**

#	Question	Response
21	<p><b>Exhibit A, Page 6</b> <b>And Template G, Analytics, Reporting, and Usage Requirement AN1.13</b></p> <p>The RFP states, “When HEI 2.0 goes live, it must make available many standard health care financial and utilization reports.”</p> <p>The requirement states, “Proposer's solution will provide the capability to generate standard Covered California-defined reports.”</p> <p>Do these reports exist today? Will the State please list the reports that must be available at go live and provide descriptions of each?</p>	<p>Other than ad hoc query output and the HEI 1.0 vendor’s Express Dashboard report (summarized enrollment demographics, financials, medical / clinical treatment and drug utilization, treatment quality, and population health and risk data which can be generated by calendar or running year for one or all QHP Issuers), no such reports exist today. Covered California anticipates itself, the HEI 2.0 vendor, or both collaboratively creating such reports for topics both referenced in the RFP and as yet unforeseen. Some examples of anticipated reports are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bidder’s proposed Express Dashboard report equivalents or alternatives;</li> <li>• Reports suggested by HEI data references in the Covered California contracts with QHP and QDP Issuers, especially QHP Attachments 7 and 14;</li> <li>• Reports designed with Covered California to satisfy California Assembly Bill 929 (2019) public reporting requirements; and</li> <li>• Other reports available with the bidder’s proposed HEI 2.0 solution.</li> </ul>
22	<p><b>Exhibit A, Section F, Pages 11-12</b></p> <p>The RFP states that all services must be performed on site at Covered California. Approximately how many work stations will the State provide to the Contractor?</p>	<p>Covered California has modified this language in Model Contract Exhibit A. (See RFP Addendum #1.) Bidders should use their best judgment to propose efficient staffing location models which enable them to satisfy Covered California’s requirements.</p> <p>Current HEI 1.0 vendor staff work remotely, not at Covered California’s offices. Nonetheless, should HEI 2.0 bidders propose that their staff work onsite at Covered California’s Expo Boulevard location in Sacramento, Covered California can accommodate as many as three HEI 2.0 vendor staff with desktop computers, internet connections, Covered CA email addresses, and desktop telephones.</p>
23	<p><b>Exhibit A, Section D, #4, Page 7</b></p> <p>Will the State please provide the HEI 1.0 requirement documentation, design documentation, data models, and historical data as a part of the procurement library?</p>	<p>No, but selected applicable documents may be made available to the successful bidder following contract execution.</p>

**RFP 2020-04 – Healthcare Evidence Initiative 2.0  
Questions and Answers**

#	Question	Response
24	<p><b>Page 2, Template K – Work Plan</b></p> <p>The instructions ask for a “Work breakdown structure;” and a “High-level project schedule for all project deliverables and milestones”</p> <p>Will the State accept a Microsoft Project document including a WBS column, to meet the WBS requirement?</p>	<p>Yes, this is acceptable.</p>
25	<p><b>Template G, Requirement RFP AG2.16</b></p> <p>The State is asking for “Medicare reference pricing.” Please confirm that this requirement is asking for the application of publicly available Medicare pricing information at the appropriate line or header level.</p>	<p>Yes, Covered California requires that the successful bidder apply publicly available Medicare reimbursement pricing information at the appropriate level of claim information (e.g., specific to the medical service provided and at the provider or region (catchment area) level as appropriate), in addition to retaining the claim’s own actual pricing information.</p>
26	<p><b>RFP page 7</b></p> <p><b>Section 1.10.2, Narrative Format</b></p> <p><b>And Templates A-F, H, and J-L</b></p> <p>Page 7 indicates that proposers may use a “Times New Roman, Arial, or Calibri font of at least 12-point size throughout unless a form is required...that contains a smaller font.”</p> <p>The RFP templates (as provided) are set up in Arial 11-point font.</p> <p>Are proposers required to insert narrative proposal responses into the provided RFP Templates?</p> <p>Or are the Word templates provided as instructions for setting up proposers’ own templates for the narrative response?</p> <p>If required to use the RFP templates, please confirm proposers should modify the templates to conform with the RFP instructions in Section 1.10.2 (i.e., response font size, headers/footers.)</p>	<p>Bidders may either insert narrative response content into the provided RFP response templates or use the provided RFP response templates as instructions for creating their own narrative responses. In either case bidders must follow RFP instructions regarding response content font and type size, headers, footers, pagination, etc.</p>

**RFP 2020-04 – Healthcare Evidence Initiative 2.0  
Questions and Answers**

#	Question	Response
27	<p><b>Exhibit B, Attachment 1 - Cost workbook and Template N Cost Workbook</b></p> <p>Do both pricing documents have to be filled in for submission?</p>	<p>Bidders must complete Template N – Cost Workbook as requested. Bidders should not complete Model Contract Exhibit B, Attachment 1 – Cost Worksheet; Covered California will incorporate the selected vendor’s Template N content into the contract’s Exhibit B, Attachment 1 – Cost Worksheet following successful procurement. Bidders must also follow RFP instructions regarding submission of proposed changes or exceptions to the Model Contract.</p>
28	<p><b>Requirement AG2.06</b></p> <p>What is the existing MDM solution that the incoming vendor can leverage for patient and provider identifiers?</p>	<p>There is no existing Master Patient Index or MDM solution to be leveraged. Bidders must propose their own solutions.</p>
29	<p><b>Template I SP.16</b></p> <p>The requirement states the solution must be, “c. Capable of transferring data over an Internet browser interface (i.e., HTML over HTTP).”</p> <p>Will the State please clarify the need for data transfer over unencrypted Internet paths as specified in sub-item C?</p>	<p>Covered California has modified this language in Template I. (See RFP Addendum #1.)</p>
30	<p><b>Exhibit A, Section F, Pages 11-12</b></p> <p>The text of Exhibit A reads “The Contractor is required to perform all services under this Agreement on site at Covered California, unless directed otherwise by the project representative listed in this Exhibit.”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Does this statement apply to the fractional SME staff required in requirement AN2.01 (a.)?</li> <li>2) Does this requirement also apply to back office staff that are performing such tasks as data integration work?</li> </ol> <p>Understanding which staff need to be on site will provide vendors the ability to provide California with the best possible mix of staff at the lowest possible price.</p>	<p>Covered California has modified this language in Model Contract Exhibit A. (See RFP Addendum #1.) Bidders should use their best judgment to propose efficient staffing location models which enable them to satisfy Covered California’s requirements.</p>

**RFP 2020-04 – Healthcare Evidence Initiative 2.0  
Questions and Answers**

#	Question	Response
31	<p><b>Template G Functional Requirements Tab “QA Prvdr Qlty &amp; Aud.”</b>  <b>RFP Req # QA.06</b></p> <p>The requirement states that “Licensed sources of quality performance measures will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. NCQA Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set (HEDIS);</li> <li>b. Pharmacy Quality Alliance (PQA); and</li> <li>c. Any CMS Quality Ratings System (QRS) measures not included above.” <p>Is it adequate to use the QHPs calculated measures as described in QA.14 so that vendors will not need to independently produce these measures?</p> </li></ul>	<p>No, relying on QHP Issuer supplied data from QA.14 alone is insufficient; bidders must also satisfy requirement QA.06</p>
32	<p><b>Exhibit A, Section F, Page 7 (d.)</b></p> <p>The text of section d. Provider Quality and Auditing states: “HEI 2.0 must be capable of assessing provider geography, cost, quality (e.g., HEDIS, CAHPS, etc.), utilization, performance, and risk.” The document then refers readers to RFP Template G – Functional Requirements, tab “QA Prvdr Qlty &amp; Aud.”</p> <p>CAHPS is mentioned in Exhibit A, but not mentioned in the detailed requirements in Template G. Will the State please clarify exactly which performance measures are required?</p>	<p>Covered California has modified this language in Model Contract Exhibit A. (See RFP Addendum #1.) Bidders should rely on Template G – Functional Requirements, tab QA for details.</p>
33	<p><b>Exhibit A, Section G, Page 12 Key Project Personnel</b></p> <p>The text of section G. Key Project Personnel reads: “Key Project Personnel shall be dedicated to the Covered California account at least half time during the HEI 2.0 project’s implementation phase unless Covered California authorizes an alternative time commitment in writing.” Yet three of the positions (Account / Project Manager, Data Aggregation Lead, and the Data Analytics / Reporting Lead) are mentioned in the Roles and Responsibilities as “Provides full time (100%)” support for the various practice areas. Will the State please clarify the required percent dedication as well as if these personnel must be onsite?</p>	<p>Covered California has modified this language in Model Contract Exhibit A. (See RFP Addendum #1.) Bidders should use their best judgment to propose efficient staffing location models which enable them to satisfy Covered California’s requirements.</p>

**RFP 2020-04 – Healthcare Evidence Initiative 2.0  
Questions and Answers**

#	Question	Response
34	<p><b>Exhibit A (D), page 3</b></p> <p>We understand that the awarded Contractor is to establish initial and ongoing interfaces with multiple data partners. Please confirm that contracts between Covered California and the QHPs set forth the terms and conditions under which the QHP is obligated to provide data to awarded bidder. If not, what is the expectation of the State with respect to how awarded bidder is to work with data partners to establish interfaces.</p>	<p>Yes, Covered California's contracts require QHP and QDP Issuers to submit data to Covered California's HEI vendor. See Procurement Library:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "AG1.12 2021 QHP Indiv Clean Final Att 7.pdf" (Article 2, Section 2.02 Data Submission Requirements)</li> <li>• "AG1.12 2021 QHP Indiv Clean Final Att 14.pdf" (Performance Standard 2.5)</li> <li>• "AG1.12 2022 QHP Indiv Clean Draft Att 7 20210114.pdf" (Article 15, Section 15.01 Data Submission)</li> <li>• "AG1.12 2022 QHP Indiv Clean Draft Att 14 20210114.pdf" (Performance Standard 2.1)</li> <li>• "AG1.14 2021 QDP Clean Final.pdf" (Article 2, Section 2.02 Data Submission Requirements)</li> </ul>
35	<p><b>Exhibit A (4), page 7 Implementation and Transition (Out) and Template G Functional Requirements "AG1 Data Host and Mgmt" RFP Req# AG1.08</b></p> <p>The text of Implementation and Transition (Out) states: "During the first year of this Agreement, the Contractor shall replicate applicable HEI 1.0 database contents and capabilities in its own environment and perform such non-recurring implementation work as is necessary to assume all production responsibilities by the conclusion of the first year. work as is necessary to assume all production responsibilities by the conclusion of the first year."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Is the State expecting that the contractor replicates the entire HEI 1.0 database and make it available for query and reporting?</li> <li>2) Does "non-recurring implementation work" mean that this is intended to be a static copy of the HEI 1.0 database?</li> </ol> <p>Please reconcile this requirement in the Exhibit A (4), page 7 Implementation and Transition (Out) with that in AG1.08 "During the first year of its contract, Proposer will populate its own HEI 2.0 database, ensuring inclusion of historical and current data originating with suppliers (i.e., CalHEERS, QHP Issuers) and possibly also with the HEI 1.0 vendor. If needed, Covered California will work with the HEI 1.0</p>	<p>The HEI 1.0 vendor currently maintains and operates tools and a database containing enrollment, medical claims / encounters, drug claims, and capitation data from Jan. 2014 – current. Covered California's intention via this language in Model Contract Exhibit A and Template G's requirement AG1.08 is that the successful HEI 2.0 bidder populate, maintain, and operate its own tools and database containing like information for the same time span.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The HEI 1.0 vendor stores historical extract files submitted by data suppliers and will provide these and possibly additional selected data to the successful HEI 2.0 bidder for its use in constructing its own database in SFY 2021/22.</li> <li>• The successful HEI 2.0 bidder will not maintain an HEI 1.0 database, static or otherwise, inherited from the previous vendor. Rather, its own HEI 2.0 solution will enable all necessary analysis of historical data back to Jan. 2014, as did the previous vendor's.</li> <li>• Successful completion of most HEI 2.0 implementation activities will involve both vendors and Covered California comparing HEI 1.0 vs. 2.0 contents through SFY 2021/22, recognizing and</li> </ul>

**RFP 2020-04 – Healthcare Evidence Initiative 2.0  
Questions and Answers**

#	Question	Response
	vendor to help facilitate provision of applicable data to Proposer without exposing HEI 1.0 vendor's confidential or proprietary trade secrets and intellectual property.”	reconciling / documenting any significant differences in database contents, and transitioning to complete reliance on HEI 2.0 for ongoing analytic support.
36	<p><b>Exhibits D, Privacy and Security Requirements, Exhibit E, Supplemental Privacy &amp; Security Requirements</b></p> <p>Exhibit D (B) (3) defines Federal Tax Information (FTI) as any return or return information as defined under the IRS Code, and received from the IRS or secondary source, such as SSA, Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement or Bureau of Fiscal Service. FTI includes any information created by the recipient that is derived from return or return information. Further, Exhibit E, Supplemental Privacy &amp; Security Requirements includes compliance with IRS Pub. 1075 (#3, #9 and #23) pertaining to the protection of FTI.</p> <p>1). As compliance with IRS 1075 will require bidders to host in a Government Cloud environment (FedRamp), which will increase cost to Covered California, can Covered California please advise whether the data sources that the awarded vendor will receive, host, access and store contains FTI?</p> <p>2). If no FTI data will be part of the data set, may the requirement to adhere to IRS pub 1075 be removed so bidders can price to host in a non-government FedRamp environment?</p>	<p>Covered California has modified this language in Model Contract Exhibit E. (See RFP Addendum #1.) The successful HEI 2.0 vendor is not expected to receive, host, access, or store FTI.</p> <p>Covered California’s understanding, however, is that FedRAMP certification would still be required for bidders proposing cloud-based solutions, due to the impact of NIST 800-53 and MARS-E.</p>
37	<p><b>Exhibit C Section BBB page 34, California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA)</b></p> <p>Is Covered California subject to the CCPA?</p>	<p>State agencies and nonprofit organizations are not subject to the CCPA. Covered California requires its contractors to comply with the CCPA if they are subject to it. According to the California Attorney General’s office, the CCPA applies as follows:</p> <p>The CCPA applies to for-profit businesses that do business in California and meet any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have a gross annual revenue of over \$25 million;</li> <li>• Buy, receive, or sell the personal information of 50,000 or more California residents, households, or devices; or</li> <li>• Derive 50% or more of their annual revenue from selling California residents’ personal information.</li> </ul>

**RFP 2020-04 – Healthcare Evidence Initiative 2.0  
Questions and Answers**

#	Question	Response
38	<p><b>Exhibit A (4), page 7 Implementation and Transition (Out) and Template G Functional Requirements “AG1 Data Host and Mgmt” RFP Req# AG1.08</b></p> <p>Can the State please add sizing information from HEI 1.0 (in GB or TB) to the procurement library so that vendors can understand the scope of the HEI 1.0 database redeployment which appears to be required?</p>	<p>Current HEI 1.0 production database is 234 GB.</p>
39	<p><b>Exhibit D Section D</b></p> <p>1. Our understanding is that awarded vendor would not be a BAA as Covered California is not a Covered Entity, but rather a Health Oversight Agency. Is this correct?</p> <p>A. If correct,</p> <p>i. Please clarify the awarded contractor’s obligations under the HIPAA Privacy and Security Rules.</p> <p>ii. Please advise if certain contract terms may be amended to reflect vendor’s scope of services under the contract and designation under applicable laws and regulation, for example, Consumer Rights under Exhibit D, Section D, among others. In the Consumer Rights example, vendor would not respond directly to consumer requests, rather, individual requests would be processed by providers, QHPs, or Covered California, and, vendor would process an individual request as directed by a formal notice from Covered California. Similar examples may exist throughout the model contract.</p>	<p>The questioner’s understanding is correct. For clarity re: the awarded contractor’s obligations under the HIPAA Privacy and Security Rules, please refer to the RFP’s detailed requirements (particularly those in Template I tab RSA), Model Contract Exhibits D and E, and the following Procurement Library documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “AG1.12 2021 QHP Indiv Clean Final Att 7.pdf” (Article 2, Section 2.02 Data Submission Requirements)</li> <li>• “AG1.12 2022 QHP Indiv Clean Draft Att 7 20210114.pdf” (Article 15, Section 15.01 Data Submission)</li> <li>• “AG1.14 2021 QDP Clean Final.pdf” (Article 2, Section 2.02 Data Submission Requirements)</li> </ul> <p>Please refer also to Covered California’s Privacy Policy and Practices (<a href="https://www.coveredca.com/privacy/">https://www.coveredca.com/privacy/</a>), including information relating to consumers wishing to opt out of HEI. In the latter example, as supported by Template I’s requirement RSA.35, Covered California staff will continue to accept and track consumer opt out requests, periodically forwarding the cumulative consumer opt out list to the HEI 2.0 vendor, which in turn will ensure that data for these individuals are removed and excluded from HEI 2.0.</p> <p>Finally, bidders should follow instructions in RFP Sections 1.10.3 and 3.4.3 re: submission of proposed changes or exceptions to the Model Contract. The latter section precludes significant changes to Model Contract Exhibits D and E.</p>

**RFP 2020-04 – Healthcare Evidence Initiative 2.0  
Questions and Answers**

#	Question	Response
40	<p><b>GENERAL FORMATTING: <u>Question</u></b> – For narrative responses that have multiple bullets, can we respond to each bullet instead of collating our responses from each bullet? <b>The example below from Template H would represent our proposed format:</b></p> <p><b>1.1 Data Transformation and Delivery</b></p> <p>Describe how the proposed solution and method fulfill the requirements identified in Template G – Functional Requirements, tab AG2 – Data Transformation and Delivery. Covered California is particularly interested in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How Proposer proposes to assess and maximize – initially and over time, via enforcement and / or collaboration – the quality and completeness of suppliers’ data, including issues requiring deep Proposer understanding of medical and drug claims / encounter data and their use in analytics, e.g., overuse of non-specific diagnosis codes or insufficient identification of provider specialties by specific QHP Issuers (AG2.01-03, AG2.20) &lt;Response&gt; [Proposed format]</li> <li>• How Proposer proposes to implement user views, role types, and security profiles (AG2.05) and how that implementation will be reflected in user query experience and analytic capabilities &lt;Response&gt; [Proposed format]</li> <li>• How Proposer proposes to implement a Master Patient Index (AG2.06) and how that implementation will be reflected in user query experience and analytic capabilities &lt;Response&gt; [Proposed format]</li> <li>• Which cost, utilization, and quality benchmarks Proposer proposes to implement and why, i.e., why Proposer believes the proposed benchmarks are best fit / most applicable to Covered California (AG2.15) &lt;Response&gt; [Proposed Format]</li> </ul>	<p>Bidders may respond to each bullet, as shown in the questioner’s example, but in doing so they risk responding only to areas of Covered California’s stated particular interest and therefore omitting responses for all other detailed requirements from each referenced Template G requirements tab.</p>

**RFP 2020-04 – Healthcare Evidence Initiative 2.0  
Questions and Answers**

#	Question	Response
41	<p data-bbox="203 296 893 441">Exhibit A – Scope of Work, Section EE page 22: Exhibit C - Attachment 1 Resumes template was not included with the RFP but is included as a requirement in the Attachment 6 Administrative Requirements Checklist. Our questions is:</p> <p data-bbox="203 510 893 579">Does the vendor need to complete and submit with proposal response? If so, can you please provide the missing file.</p>	<p data-bbox="930 296 1580 365">Yes, bidder is required to submit Exhibit C, Attachment 1 Resumes.</p> <p data-bbox="930 384 1479 453">Attachment added to Model Contract (see RFP Addendum 1).</p>