RFP 2025-06 Healthcare Evidence Initiative (HEI) 3.0
Questions and Answers

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
1.	Can Covered California clarify whether data from "the providers that serve them" will be collected directly from providers or via the Issuers' submissions? In other words, does the HEI 3.0 solution require gathering data directly from healthcare providers (e.g. via claims or provider reporting), or will all provider-related data (utilization, cost, quality) be supplied through the participating Issuers? RFP 2025-06, Section 2.2 (Purpose), p.15	The HEI 3.0 solution will incorporate data from QDP and QHP Issuers. See also: • Template G ‑ Functional Requirements AG1.08 ‑ 17 and QA.14 • Template I ‑ Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirement RSA.23
2.	Are there specific data format standards or schemas that Issuers must use for submitting data, or can the contractor propose the data formats? For example, does Covered CA require use of an existing standard (such as X12, HL7/FHIR, APCD formats, etc.), or will the contractor have flexibility to design the data schema as long as the information is normalized and standardized? RFP 2025-06, Section 2.2 (Purpose), p.15	Yes, there are specific data format standards or schemas that Issuers must use for submitting data. See the following: • Template G – Functional Requirements AG1.13, 14, and 16 and QA.14 • Procurement Library Documents, Data Supplier Extract Specs

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
3.	Is the HEI 3.0 solution expected to integrate with any existing Covered California systems or databases (for example, CalHEERS or other internal data systems)? Additionally, are there any planned integrations or data exchanges with external systems or agencies (such as those of DHCS or CalPERS) as part of this project, or is the reference to those agencies only to illustrate similar analysis capabilities? RFP 2025-06, Section 2.2 (Purpose), p.15	See Template G – Functional Requirements AG1.08 – 11. There are no planned integrations or data exchanges with CalPERS. Periodic incorporation of reference and benchmarking data from external parties and govt. agencies may be necessary for some requirements, e.g., AG2.08 – 10, 12, 14 – 15, and QA.10.
4.	Will the HEI 3.0 solution need to incorporate or compare data from external sources (e.g., Medi-Cal/Medicaid data from DHCS or public employer data from CalPERS)? The RFP draws parallels to DHCS and CalPERS analytics – should the contractor plan to obtain data from these external agencies or just ensure our solution has similar analytic capabilities? RFP 2025-06, Section 2.2 (Purpose), p.15	There are no planned integrations or data exchanges with CalPERS. Periodic incorporation of reference and benchmarking data from external parties and govt. agencies may be necessary for some requirements, e.g., AG2.08 – 10, 12, 14 – 15, and QA.10.
5.	Does Covered California have a preferred risk adjustment model or methodology that the HEI 3.0 analytics should use? The RFP mentions "standardized risk adjustment." Should we assume use of existing models (e.g., HHS-HCC risk adjustment used in ACA markets or DxCG models), or should the proposer recommend a risk adjustment approach for analyzing cost and utilization differences? RFP 2025-06, Section 2.2 (Purpose), p.15	See the following: • Template G ‑ Functional Requirement MO.03 • Template H ‑ Functional Requirements Approach, Section 4.2 ‑ Modeling • Use Case PMD A4 ‑ Risk Based Analytics

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
6.	Could Covered California elaborate on the requirements around "episodes of care and disease severity" analysis? For example, is there a specific episode grouping methodology or severity adjustment tool Covered CA expects (such as episode groupers or DRG/severity indices), or should the contractor propose an approach for episode-of-care analysis and measuring disease severity? RFP 2025-06, Section 3.3.7 (Functional Requirements), p.18	A contractor should propose an approach, as identified in Template H. See the following: • Template G‑Functional Requirements E.01‑10 • Template H‑Functional Requirements Approach, Section 4.3‑Episodes of Care and Disease Severity • Use Case EQT A4 – Health Care Utilization • Use Case EQT B2 – Member Level Cross-Carrier / Payer Data Exchange
7.	Does Covered California have any preferences or requirements regarding the technology platform for the HEI 3.0 solution? The Scope lists necessary capabilities (aggregation, storage, hosting, etc.) including "software licenses," which suggests the vendor might provide commercial tools. We want to confirm if Covered California has standards or if we have flexibility to propose the tech stack and tools (including any third-party software) as long as requirements are met. For example, the RFP notes "data hosting" as a needed capability – should the contractor plan to host the solution in their own cloud environment, or is Covered CA expecting to leverage a state-provided hosting environment or specific cloud provider? RFP 2025-06, Section 2.2 (Purpose), p.15	Generally speaking, Proposer has "flexibility to propose the tech stack and tools (including any third-party software) as long as requirements are met." However, a Proposer should consider if and how proposed tools could integrate with Covered California's existing technology platforms for enrollment analytics. Proposer should plan to host the solution in its own environment, cloud or otherwise. See also: • Template G‑Functional Requirements AG1.01‑02; AG2.08‑10 and 14; CA.17; MO.03; E.10; QA.02‑03, 06‑07, and 10; and DA.01‑02 • Template H – Functional Requirements Approach • Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirements PM.03, DDC.02, and SP.16 • Use Cases EQT A1 – Plan Performance Report and PERD A4 – Environment(s) for Complex Analyses

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
8.	Are there any restrictions on data location or off-shore work for this project? For example, must all HEI 3.0 data hosting and processing occur within the United States or California? And can any project work be performed outside the U.S. (offshore), or is it required that all work (especially that involving sensitive data) be done onshore by U.S.-located personnel only? RFP 2025-06, Template I (Project Requirements), p.18	Per Model Contract Exhibit D, Attachment 1 – Security Contract Attachment, Section 4 – Location, "All Contractor services, employees/agents/workers/contractors, and data storage are required to be within the US and its territories." See also the following: • Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirements SP.07 and RSA.12 • Model Contract Exhibit A – Scope of Work, Section F – Reporting Headquarters Location
9.	Is there a specified data retention policy for the HEI 3.0 data? For example, must the contractor retain all collected data for a certain number of years, and are there requirements to archive or purge data after a period? Understanding any data retention and archival requirements will help us design the storage solution appropriately (e.g., how much historical data to keep accessible vs. archived). RFP 2025-06, Section 2.2 (Purpose), p.15	The proposer must retain all data files received on behalf of Covered California. The most recent ten years of data must be accessible, while earlier data files may be archived. See Template G – Functional Requirements AG1.03, 06 – 07, MA.08, and DA.06. Additionally, pursuant to Exhibit C (IT General Terms and Conditions), Section D (Audit), contractors are required to maintain records subject to audit for a minimum of ten (10) years following final payment, unless a longer records-retention period is otherwise stipulated.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
10.	What are the expectations regarding data quality assurance and auditing of the submitted data? Will Covered California provide any data validation or should the contractor implement all data quality checks? For instance, is the contractor responsible for detecting data anomalies and working with Issuers to correct them, and are there audit requirements (either internal or external audits) for the data and analytics outputs that we should build into our processes? RFP 2025-06, Section 3.3.7 (Functional Requirements), p.18	Proposer will implement all data quality checks and is responsible for detecting data anomalies and working with data suppliers to correct them. See the following: • Template G – Functional Requirements AG2.01 – 03 and 18 • Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirement SP.14 • Model Contract Exhibit A ‑ Scope of Work, D.2 Data Aggregation, D.4.b Routine Reporting, and G. Key Project Personnel, Data Aggregation Lead and Data Quality Lead • Procurement Library: o AG2.02, AG2,18, DDC.10 2025 HEI Data Intake & DQ Test Guidelines 20251121 o AG2.02, AG2.18, DDC.10 Assessment Criteria 2026 QDP HEI Contract Reqmts 20251201 DRAFT o AG2.02, AG2.18, DDC.10 Assessment Criteria 2026 QHP HEI Contract Reqmts 20251201 DRAFT o CA.17 HEI 3.0 – List of Predefined Scheduled Rpts 20250925

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
11.	Who will be the primary liaison with the Issuers for data submissions and issue resolution? Will Covered California itself coordinate with the QHP Issuers (e.g., enforcing deadlines, communicating requirements and changes), or is the contractor expected to directly manage communications with each Issuer's data team for obtaining data, clarifying data issues, and ensuring compliance with data submission requirements? RFP 2025-06, Section 2.2 (Purpose), p.14-15	Proposer's Data Aggregation Lead and Data Quality Lead will fill these roles. See Model Contract Exhibit A – Scope of Work, Sections D.2 – Data Aggregation and G – Key Project Personnel. Covered California's own HEI 3.0 Project Manager and selected PERD, PMD, and EQT Divisions staff will support and assist where warranted.
12.	Will QHP Issuers or providers have access to any outputs of the HEI 3.0 solution, or is it solely for Covered California's internal use? For example, does Covered CA intend to share reports or dashboards with the issuers (or even publicly, as suggested by AB 929) based on the data? We want to know if the solution should include a portal or reporting capability for external stakeholders (issuers/providers) or just internal analytics for Covered CA. Covered CA 2027 Plan Year QHP Contract Attachment 1, §I.8 (Reporting)	Proposer will provide scheduled report output, primarily data quality reports, to QDP and QHP Issuers with each monthly HEI 3.0 database build (see requirement CA.17). Providers will not typically receive reports, although their Issuers may provide selected data quality reports to them to illustrate the need to correct data. Covered California is interested in Proposers' solutions for sharing data quality metrics and reports with QDP and QHP Issuers, though a portal or reporting capability is not required. Reports are currently shared via email as PDF attachments. Proposer will also provide periodic data extracts to Covered California, e.g., for the Exchange's AB 929 Plan Performance Report, which Covered California will create and publish. No public reports or dashboards need be proposed.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
13.	What service level agreements (SLAs) or performance standards will the contractor be held to for the solution's operation? For example, is there an expected system uptime percentage, data refresh turnaround time, or query performance benchmark outlined in the requirements? We see references to "service level and performance" requirements – any details on uptime, response times, or other SLAs would help us design to meet them. RFP 2025-06, Section 3.3.9 (Project Requirements), p.18	See Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirements SP.01 – 16.
14.	Should the proposal include a transition or turnover plan for the end of the contract? We note that "Transition" is mentioned as part of project requirements. Does Covered CA expect the contractor to transition the solution (and all data) back to Covered CA or to a successor vendor at contract conclusion? If yes, are there specific activities or timeframes for this transition (knowledge transfer, data handoff, etc.) that we should account for in our proposal and work plan? RFP 2025-06, Template I (Project Requirements), p.18	We ask that the Proposer document its HEI 3.0 implementation year and first year of M&O (contract years one (1) and two (2)) in Template K – Project Work Plan and Schedule. Shortly following HEI 3.0 contract start, the Proposer will collaborate with Covered California and the HEI 2.0 Vendor on the latter's Transition (Out) Plan (see Model Contract Exhibit A – Scope of Work, Table 2 Key Milestones and Tasks). See also Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirements TR.01 - 07. Proposer may include an initial plan for its eventual transition out activities in contract year five (5) as part of its Template K – Project Work Plan and Schedule, but that is a much lower priority than the onboarding plan.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
15.	Should the cost proposal include pricing for the two optional extension years (Years 6 and 7), or just the initial 5-year term? The RFP indicates a total not-to-exceed amount including the optional years. If we are to include the optional years in our pricing, how would Covered CA prefer they be represented in the cost submission (e.g., as separate line items for each optional year, or a combined total)? Furthermore, will pricing for the optional years be evaluated as part of the proposal scoring, or considered separately at the time of potential extension? RFP 2025-06, Section 1.4 and 1.5 (Contract Term and Amount), p.4-5	The pricing for the two optional years will not be evaluated as part of the proposal scoring. Costs for the two optional extension years should be provided as separate line items. See Template N – Cost Workbook, tab 1. Total Cost Summary
16.	Is the contractor required to have personnel on-site at Covered California's offices during the project, or can work be performed remotely? The RFP notes that contractor work hours should align with Covered CA's on-site staff business hours, which suggests normal day time work. However, it does not explicitly state if any on-site presence is required. Please clarify if any key staff or activities must be done in person in California (e.g., for meetings, presentations, or data center access), or if an off-site/remote workforce is acceptable for this engagement. RFP 2025-06, Section 2.5 (Project Assumptions & Constraints), p.16	Proposer need NOT have personnel onsite at Covered California. Project work may be performed remotely.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
17.	Given the requirement to submit the proposal via email, what should we do if our proposal files are too large for a single email? And, is there a way to confirm with Covered CA that our submission has been received? For example, can we send multiple emails (and if so, how should they be labeled), or will Covered CA provide an alternative file transfer method for large files (such as an upload portal or FTP)? We want to ensure a smooth submission process, especially if the proposal with all attachments exceeds typical email size limits. RFP 2025-06, Section 1.11 (Proposal Submission), p.7	Yes, we recommend zip files, but multiple emails are allowable. Please be clear in your email that this is 1 of 2, etc. Covered California does not accept alternative file transfer method for large files. We will respond with a "confirm receipt" to your proposal.
18.	Section 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 require proposers to confirm they meet minimum qualifications and provide experience. Does Covered California require that proposer or Key Personnel experience be specific to California state agencies, or will experience with other state, federal, or quasi-governmental health entities be considered comparable? Can Covered California clarify what types of public-sector experience are considered acceptable (e.g., state, federal, or quasi-governmental analytics engagements)? RFP Section 5, Evaluation and Selection for Contract Award	Experience with other state, federal, or quasi-governmental health entities can be considered comparable. See also: • Template A – Cover Letter and Executive Summary, 5.0 Mandatory Minimum Qualifications • Template B – Proposer Experience, 2 Proposer Corporate Background and Experience

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
19.	What is the approach for evaluating and scoring subcontractors as part of the overall proposer evaluation, and how these scores will be incorporated into the prime contractor's overall score? Also, can you please describe the criteria and methodology you will use to assess each subcontractor's relevant experience, qualifications, and past performance? Exhibit A – Scope of Work, Requirements	As described in RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0, Section 4.3.1, Proposals are scored in totality rather than by each organization participating in the Proposal. The RFP describes the approach for evaluating and scoring contractors as part of the overall proposed solution where relevant. See the following in particular: • RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0, Sections 3.3 - Technical Proposal, 4 – Evaluation and Selection for Contract Award, and 5 – Preference and Incentive Programs • Various RFP response templates, e.g., Templates A – F and K
20.	Sections 2.2 and 2.3 describe HEI as an ongoing initiative supporting programmatic and policy objectives. Can Covered California clarify whether the Contractor team is expected to actively co-develop or refine HEI program structures, analytic frameworks, or operating models, or whether the primary expectation is execution within an already-defined program design? RFP 2025-06, Section 2.2 & 2.1	Covered California has documented HEI 3.0 scope and requirements as best it can throughout the RFP and associated documents. The Proposer is responsible for implementing its own solution, satisfying project requirements, and potentially refining the solution going forward. This includes providing new analytics and reporting under the guidance of Covered California staff.
21.	Can you please clarify the meaning of "Facility, professional, and ancillary financials" in the context of facility / outpatient level analysis and the output(s) that Covered California is interested in? Template G Functional Requirements, Tab "Common Analytics" (req # CA.14)	Allowed, net paid, member out-of-pocket payments (i.e., deductible, copay, and coinsurance), third-party paid, tax, and possibly other miscellaneous financial amounts associated with inpatient and outpatient facility, professional medical, and possibly other ancillary (e.g., ambulance) claims and encounters

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
22.	Does Covered California intend to request a completely new eligibility data feed(s) or add new fields to the existing file structure? Implementation	Covered California requires that the Proposer start by utilizing existing HEI 2.0 and APCD-CDL™ eligibility / enrollment data feeds. We may add new fields going forward. See the following: • Template G – Functional Requirements AG1.13 and 16 and QA.14 • Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirement RSA.23 • Procurement Library Documents, Data Supplier Extract Specs
23.	If we have staff that have spent at least 50% of their time dedicated to Covered California over the last 4-5 years, are references (outside of the current project) still expected? Template F - Key Personnel References	Covered California understands that Proposer staff having spent significant time dedicated to the Exchange over the last 4-5 years might provide client references exclusively from Covered California staff and consultants.
24.	AG1.09 states that the proposer will receive and load on/off exchange plan product and provider network information annually and "update as needed". Please elaborate on what "update as needed" is intended to cover. AG1.09	Throughout a plan year Issuers may amend the products they offer and their identifiers. Monthly receipt and processing of Issuer enrollment and claims data submissions may also reveal products (often off-Exchange) that Issuers earlier failed to identify and define. Issuers may also modify or augment provider networks throughout the plan year.
25.	Does CovCA already receive the RxDC files from the QHPs? AG2.14	Covered California does NOT already receive the Prescription Drug Data Collection (RxDC) files, either from the QHP Issuers or Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS).

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
26.	Please provide examples for anticipated "future changes" (e.g. new QHPs, new layouts) AG1.15	Re: "subject to future changes" cited in requirements AG1.12 and AG1.15, Covered California has provided links to 2026 contract listings available at https://hbex.coveredca.com/stakeholders/plan-management/contract-listings/. Proposer may wish to monitor this website's information re: 2027's and subsequent years' Covered California contracts with QDP and QHP Issuers. Each new plan year includes the possibility of Issuer additions and departures, new reports and analytics, and inclusion of data not previously incorporated, e.g., enrollees' sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) data elements.
27.	This requirement describes the need to process retroactive data replacements. It includes: "Proposer need not expect more than two such updates per data source per year." Can you elaborate on how the two updates per data source be tracked? Is it by data supplier, data type, and time period? For example, if BSC replaces January – December 2024 Medical data, and then replaces January – December 2023 Drug data, does that count as their two data replacements? Or only if the data type and time period are the same? AG1.17	Using the example given, the medical claims and drug claims replacements would count as "one such update" if processed by the Proposer at the same time. If submitted and processed at separate times in the contract year, however, these might qualify as "two such updates per data source (BSC) per year (HEI 3.0 contract year)". Data supplier and contract year are the most important considerations, and the Proposer's level of effort. Covered California expects reasonable Proposer flexibility in such areas, e.g., processing single month or single file data supplier corrections and replacements without endangering the maintenance and operation schedule or resorting to project Work Authorizations.
28.	Does Covered California want to include both HPI and SVI? AG2.08	Yes

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
29.	Does Covered California want to see the whole dataset loaded as a reference file versus having it available for a lookup AG2.09	Covered California expects codes and descriptions for reference data such as those cited in AG2.09 to be available where applicable in the Proposer's mediated and direct access analytic solutions.
30.	The requirement includes "Proposer's solution will allow for review and quarterly changes to the enrollment file". Should we anticipate scheduled changes versus ad hoc requests throughout the plan year? AG2.11	Ad hoc requests may arise but could be included in any quarterly changes.
31.	Does Covered California want to load all the example data sets listed in AG2.14 and how will they be used. AG2.14	Covered California has provided its requirement and looks forward to reviewing the Proposer's intended implementation in its solution(s). We expect to compare our own HEI 3.0 data and analytic results to these benchmarks.
32.	Can Covered California provide examples of "outside data sources"? Can Covered California also clarify if data imported from outside data sources would reflect existing data model values (e.g. list of person ids) CA.05	Data imported from outside data sources would likely reflect existing data models; a list of person IDs to define a limited population for analysis would be a common use case for this requirement. Other use cases could include a mapping from ZIP Code to congressional district or a custom list of procedure codes used to define a set of claims of interest.
33.	Direct Access Analytic Development Environment – Does Covered California require the full 10 years of history data? DA.03	Yes
34.	Please clarify what is meant by "cycle" KN.09	"Cycle" = iteration or session. Some end users may not be available for the first cycle and would need to be trained in the second cycle.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
35.	Please clarify what details are needed for transformation logic and database design as it pertains to the Transition Plan. TR.01	For example, Proposer may have accommodated data suppliers by accepting data values and formats not explicitly documented in data extract and submission specifications and then applying transformation logic to convert incoming data to expected values and formats before subsequent processing. We would expect Proposer to document and transition any such special or supplier-specific transformation logic to Covered California. We would also expect Proposer to update and provide all M&O documentation, including of data anomalies and database contents and structures, to Covered California.
36.	Please provide an analytic use case scenario for item D - Create a stratification variable based on another query or logic. MA.06	This requirement is intended to give Covered California users flexibility to develop ad hoc custom fields for stratification based on logic within the product. See examples below: • A flag indicating whether a member has at least three primary care encounters over six months to identify demographics of high utilizers of primary care • A regional grouping identifying whether a hospital is based in Northern or Southern California based on its county to allow analysis of different average cost of care in each of these areas

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
37.	Please define or provide examples of the "risk assessment methodologies using alternative specifications". MO.03	Covered California may ask the Proposer to calculate a risk score using different populations in order to examine the impact of including or excluding differing groups on the overall risk pool. Additionally, Covered California may ask the Proposer to calculate risk scores under proposed updates to the standard risk assessment methodology, such as HHS-HCC or CDPS, in order to project the effects of proposed updates to the risk pool assessment. See also Use Case PMD A4 – Risk Based Analytics.
38.	Do we need to restrict Covered California end users if they are outside of the U.S.? RSA.12	Yes. Covered California end users will NOT be located outside the U.S. See Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirement RSA.12. Additionally, pursuant to Exhibit D, Attachment 1 (Security Contract Attachment), section 4 (Location), All contracted services, including data storage and workers (employees and contractors) that access Covered California data are required to be located within the US and its territories. By written approval, workers may reside outside of the US but will be restricted to non-production environments and will not have access to PII.
39.	Please define "audit records" RSA.20	Audit records referenced in requirement RSA.20 capture the types of activity noted in requirements RSA.16 - 19.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
40.	Please define performance metrics and accounting information SP.12	Performance metrics and system accounting information cited by requirement SP.12 can include metrics and information cited in other requirements – SP, RSA, or otherwise. Examples are solution availability (SP.01 - 03), RPO activity (SP.05), RTO activity (SP.06), solution performance (SP.10 - 11), and data quality feedback timeliness (SP.14).
41.	How does Covered California plan to use these standardized directory databases? In data quality and/or reporting? If in reporting, please provide examples. QA.02	Covered California expects to use the Proposer's solution and cited "standardized provider directory databases" to validate the appropriateness of data submitted by Issuers and to conduct various analyses. For examples, see the Procurement Library Documents, Use Cases, especially EQT A3 – Primary Care Spend, EQT B1 & C1 – Continuity of Care, and PMD A3 – Provider Network Analytics.
42.	Who is the incumbent? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0- General	Merative US LLP.
43.	Is Covered California willing to extend the submission date by 2 weeks? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Section 1.2 – Key Action Dates	No.
44.	Can the minimum qualifications be met by a prime proposer only? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Section 5.2; Templates A & B	Yes.
45.	Can the same individual serve multiple roles? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Sections 3.3.5–3.3.6	Yes. As noted in Model Contract Exhibit A – Scope of Work, Section G – Key Project Personnel, however, "Covered California has drawn on its experience to document the Key Project Personnel".

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
46.	How will Covered California evaluate hourly rates versus FFP totals? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Sections 1.5; 3.3.13	Covered California will assess Proposer's FFP costs for one-time implementation services as part of the overall proposed cost. Covered California will not assess Proposer's hourly rates, but if Proposer is successful, any of its future Work Authorization cost estimates for previously unanticipated work must be based on the proposed hourly rates. See the following: • RFP 2025-06: HEI 3.0, Sections 1.5 Contract Amount, 1.6 Contract Amendment, 1.10.6 Assessment of Proposals, 3.3.13 Cost Proposal, and 4.3.6 Cost Proposal • Template N – Cost Workbook • Model Contract Exhibit A – Scope of Work, Section E – Unanticipated Tasks • Model Contract Exhibit B, Attachment 1 – Cost Worksheet, Section D – Labor Rates
47.	How many historical years must be onboarded at implementation? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Sections 2.2; 3.3.7	At least the ten most recent years of data must be onboarded at implementation. See Template G – Functional Requirement AG1.06.
48.	Does Covered California provide a canonical data model, or must the vendor propose one? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Sections 2.2; 3.3.7–3.3.8	Proposer must provide its own data model, but Covered California expects that existing HEI 2.0 database structures and contents and this RFP's requirements would be accommodated and supported within that model.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
49.	Which analytic domains must be production-ready first? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Sections 2.2; 3.3.7–3.3.8	Covered California does not require that a particular analytic domain be production-ready first, e.g., mediated before direct access analytic solution, QHP before QDP data, enrollment before claims and capitation data, etc. Proposer must ensure, however, completion of nearly all implementation activities in contract year one so that it may assume full M&O responsibilities. See also: • Model Contract Exhibit A – Scope of Work, D. General Scope or Tasks • Model Contract Exhibit B, Attachment 1 – Cost Worksheet, B. One-Time Implementation • Template G – Functional Requirements, esp. AG1.08 • Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirements • Template K – Project Work Plan and Schedule • Template N – Cost Workbook
50.	Are specific BI or statistical tools preferred? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Sections 2.2; 3.3.7–3.3.8	Covered California prefers no specific BI or statistical tools. Proposer's solution must address related requirements, however, e.g., Template G – Functional Requirements CA.11, DA.02, and QA.06.
51.	Is there a preferred cloud provider or hosting model? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Sections 3.3.9–3.3.10	Covered California prefers no specific cloud provider or hosting model other than what might otherwise be identified in the RFP requirements.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
52.	Are multi-tenant architectures acceptable? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Sections 3.3.9–3.3.10	Multi-tenant architectures are acceptable if they provide effective logical data separation, robust security controls, and comply with all applicable regulatory requirements. Proposer should review Model Contract Exhibits D – Privacy Addendum and D, Attachment 1 – Security Contract Attachment to confirm and document architecture solution(s) compliance in its proposal.
53.	What are the expected data growth and compute scaling assumptions? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Sections 3.3.9–3.3.10	Each new plan year should result in the addition of approximately 15% more claims and encounters, using Model Contract Exhibit A – Scope of Work, Table 1. Covered California Projected Data Sources and Volumes, Item "Number of unique enrollees / claims" as the baseline.
54.	Are any GenAI use cases explicitly prohibited? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Section 4.1.3 – GenAI	Covered California has documented GenAI response requirements and looks forward to reviewing any intended implementation in Proposer's solution(s). See also: • RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0, Sections 3.4.1, 3.4.4, and 6 • Template K – Project Work Plan and Schedule, Section 2.0 - Artificial Intelligence Efficiencies • Model Contract Exhibit C – IT General Terms and Conditions, Section WW – GenAI Disclosure and Conditions • Generative Artificial Intelligence Risk Assessment (HBEX 707) Covered California expects the selected bidder to adhere to our Acceptable Use Policy, which will be provided prior to the start of work.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
55.	What approval process applies for introducing new GenAI capabilities? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Section 4.1.3 – GenAI	Covered California has documented GenAI response requirements and looks forward to reviewing any intended implementation in Proposer's solution(s). See also: • RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0, Sections 3.4.1, 3.4.4, and 6 • Template K – Project Work Plan and Schedule, Section 2.0 - Artificial Intelligence Efficiencies • Model Contract Exhibit C – IT General Terms and Conditions, Section WW – GenAI Disclosure and Conditions • Generative Artificial Intelligence Risk Assessment (HBEX 707) The selected bidder must seek prior Covered California approval when using any GenAI tools. The bidder must include the completed HBEX707 with submission and submit a new/updated HBEX707 when introducing GenAI that modifies or changes the originally approved HBEX707.
56.	What incumbent systems or vendors must be transitioned? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Sections 3.3.9–3.3.11	None

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
57.	What documentation and training artifacts are mandatory? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Sections 3.3.9–3.3.11	See the following: • Model Contract Exhibit A – Scope of Work, Table 2. Key Milestones and Tasks • Model Contract Exhibit B, Attachment 1 – Cost Worksheet, B. One-Time Implementation • Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirements • Template N – Cost Workbook
58.	Which SLAs are considered non-negotiable? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Exhibit A; Exhibit B	None of the SP requirements documented in Template I are non-negotiable. See that template's "Proposer Instructions" tab re: documenting requirements not met. See also Template J – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirements Approach, 3.1 Service Level and Performance.
59.	Are real-time monitoring dashboards required? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Exhibit A; Exhibit B	No, not specifically, although Functional Requirement AG2.03 item b describes similar functionality.
60.	Can you give us an example of what innovations are expected? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Section 2.5; Exhibit A	No

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
61.	Could you provide the current infrastructure and architecture of V2, including applications, licenses, databases, schemas and data models, data sources, ETL and aggregation processes, reporting platform and current reports, user roles, access controls, SLAs, support and development staff, list and details of work authorizations requested over the period of the contract? RFP Attachments / HEI 2.0 Current State Architecture	Merative's Health Insights / Advantage Suite serve as the HEI 2.0 core. We have already identified data sources throughout the RFP. For current reports, see Template G – Functional Requirement CA.17 as well as 2026 QDP and QHP Assessment Criteria documents and the list of predefined scheduled reports provided in the Procurement Library. For user roles, see the response to Question No. 66. HEI 2.0 Work Authorizations have primarily addressed externally driven changes, including implementation of data from new QDP and QHP Issuers, retesting of data intake processes for Issuers replacing their own legacy software, implementation and refinement of benchmark pricing capabilities, refinements in enrollee race, ethnicity, and language reporting, extraordinary historical data correction efforts undertaken by Issuers, incorporating additional CalHEERS enrollment data elements into the HEI 2.0 database, and refining the format and content of predefined and scheduled large data extracts.
62.	Are the systems and processes owned by the current vendor? Are we expected to provide a new platform and architecture to which we will migrate or will we be taking over the existing platform and processes? Model Contract / HEI 2.0 Transition	HEI 2.0 Vendor owns current systems and processes. Proposer is expected to provide its own existing platform and architecture, proven by other similar clients' use, to which it will migrate. See also Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirements, esp. DDC.02.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
63.	Is there any provision in V2 contract to rebadge existing support and development staff if needed as part of the transition? Model Contract / HEI 2.0 Transition	HEI 2.0 Vendor and Covered California staff will assist and support the Proposer when appropriate during implementation, i.e., year one of the HEI 3.0 contract. This is particularly true of HEI 2.0 Vendor data management staff providing historical data submissions to the Proposer and the HEI 2.0 Vendor and Proposer staff collaborating on the HEI 2.0 Vendor's Transition (Out) Plan and the Proposer's Project Management Plan (PM.02) and Project Workplan and Schedule (PM.03-04). See also Templates E – Proposer Project Organization and Staffing, 1. Project Organization and K – Project Work Plan and Schedule.
64.	While the data needs to reside onshore, is there a restriction on support and development staff being onshore as well? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Section 2.5	Yes. See Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirements SP.07 and RSA.12.
65.	For work authorization line item in the Cost Worksheet, are we expected to provide an estimate as this is unanticipated work? If so, are these estimates binding? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Template N – Cost Workbook	Yes, Proposer must populate Template N – Cost Workbook, tab "1. Total Cost Summary", line C – Work Authorizations (i.e., cells with light-green highlight, as noted in Instructions tab). Proposer estimates will be binding. See also RFP 2025-06: HEI 3.0, Sections 1.5 Contract Amount, 1.6 Contract Amendment, 1.10.6 Assessment of Proposals, 3.3.13 Cost Proposal, and 4.3.6 Cost Proposal.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
66.	What is the userbase of the system regarding number of users, user roles, access levels and description of usage by role Use Case Documentation User and Roles	See Template G – Functional Requirements AG2.05, MA.01, and DA.01 and Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirements RSA.06 – 07. Current HEI 2.0 user permission levels are: • Basic ‑ Access to data via HEI 2.0 Vendor's mediated access analytic solution, no access to direct person identifiers • Advanced (very few users given this access) – May access or receive extracts with PII / identifiers to link to Covered California's administrative enrollment systems
67.	What are the user support needs for the platform, channels of support needed, hours of support required and support SLAs? Model Contract – Exhibit A Operations and Support	Covered California has attempted to provide throughout this RFP the parameters enabling Proposer to estimate its level of effort. The following content should be particularly useful: • Model Contract Exhibit A – Scope of Work, D. General Scope or Tasks and G. Key Project Personnel • Template E – Proposer Project Organization and Staffing • Template G – Functional Requirements • Template H – Functional Requirements Approach • Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirements • Template K – Project Work Plan and Schedule • Template N – Cost Workbook • Procurement Library documentation, including Use Cases

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:

68.	Among the required HEI 3.0 capabilities, which outcomes are the highest priority for the first year of the contract?
	
	RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Section 2.2
		• Incorporating historical data from HEI 2.0 Vendor and data feeds from all suppliers (AG1 reqmts.)
		
		• Editing and validating incoming data and generating data quality reports (AG2.01-03, other AG2, and CA.17 reqmts.)
		
		• Refreshing and releasing the resulting solution environment(s) to Covered CA (most other functional reqmts.)
		
		• Assuming ongoing M&O responsibility
		
		• Implementing mediated access and direct access analytic solutions (MA and DA reqmts.)
		
		• Completing all implementation-related activities:
		
		   o Model Contract Exhibit A – Scope of Work, D. General Scope or Tasks, 5. Implementation and Transition (Out), 6. Training, and 8. Key Milestones and Tasks
		
		   o Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirements, tabs PM, DDC, and KN.

69.	Which deliverables are considered regulatory-critical versus primarily for internal decision support? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Section 2.2	Almost all deliverables and analytic output anticipated will support Covered California's internal decision making. The most notable exception is AB 929 Plan Performance Reporting supported in Functional Requirements AG2.17, CA.17, QA.06 - 07, and Use Case EQT A1 – Plan Performance Report. Other Use Cases documented in the Procurement Library anticipate analytic output supporting internal decisions as well as informing external policy makers.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
70.	Are there specific Board, legislative, or regulatory milestones that HEI 3.0 must support on a fixed timeline? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Section 1.2	HEI 3.0 analytic output should be available to support Covered California's March – June negotiations with QDP and QHP Issuers regarding the upcoming policy year. Major data extracts supporting Use Cases EQT A1 – Plan Performance Report and EQT A6 – Population Health Profile should be executed in April – June.
71.	Which HEI 2.0 components and datasets must be replicated exactly versus modernized or improved? AB 929 Health Plan Performance Report Reporting Requirements	In general, Proposer should propose its solution based on RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 contents, without regard to specific HEI 2.0 components. HEI 2.0 Vendor owns current systems and processes. Proposer is expected to provide its own existing platform and architecture, proven by other similar clients' use, to which it will migrate. If this question is specific to the AB 929 Plan Performance Report, however, Proposer should plan to replicate existing data extract formats except for possible updates to be identified and required by Covered California and by third parties from whom quality performance measures are licensed (e.g., when the third parties publish updates to the underlying measure specifications). See Template G – Functional Requirement QA.06. As noted elsewhere, Covered California will create and publish the AB 929 Plan Performance Report after receiving the Proposer's data extracts. Proposer need not plan to produce the public reports or dashboards created by Covered California.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
72.	Is a parallel run with HEI 2.0 expected, and if so, for how long? Model Contract / HEI 2.0 Transition	This depends upon when the Proposer is able to begin executing HEI 3.0 components to demonstrate compliance with Covered California's requirements. Ideally that starting point would be between Dec 2026 and May 2027, given planned unavailability of HEI 2.0 functionality as of 7/1/2027. Covered California expects to see details in Proposer's Template K – Project Work Plan and Schedule. See also the following: • Model Contract Exhibit A – Scope of Work, D. General Scope or Tasks, 8. Key Milestones and Tasks • Model Contract Exhibit B, Attachment 1 – Cost Worksheet, B. One-Time Implementation • Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirements DDC.03 - 12 • Template N – Cost Workbook, tab "2. One-Time Implementation"
73.	Are there known limitations or challenges with the current HEI solution that HEI 3.0 is expected to address? AB 929 Health Plan Performance Report Current Challenges	Template G – Functional Requirements contains incremental improvements and enhancements over the current HEI 2.0. The most significant additions in HEI 3.0 would be the direct access analytic solution, additional benchmarking data sets (e.g., Medicaid (Medi-Cal) reference pricing data), ten years of easily accessible data rather than the current eight, and data quality reporting and feedback mechanisms described in requirement AG2.03.
74.	Are commercial analytics platforms acceptable as part of the solution? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Sections 3.3.7–3.3.8	Yes

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
75.	Are multi-tenant architectures acceptable if security and segregation requirements are met? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Sections 3.3.9–3.3.10	Multi-tenant architectures are acceptable if they provide effective logical data separation, robust security controls, and comply with all applicable regulatory requirements. Proposer should review Model Contract Exhibits D – Privacy Addendum and D, Attachment 1 – Security Contract Attachment to confirm and document architecture solution(s) compliance in its proposal.
76.	Are there specific data residency or hosting location constraints beyond U.S.-based hosting? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Section 2.5	No. Proposer should ensure familiarity and compliance with all applicable RFP requirements, however, including Model Contract contents.
77.	Are any GenAI use cases explicitly disallowed within HEI 3.0? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Section 4.1.3 – GenAI	Covered California has documented GenAI response requirements and looks forward to reviewing any intended implementation in Proposer's solution(s). See also: • RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0, Sections 3.4.1, 3.4.4, and 6 • Template K – Project Work Plan and Schedule, Section 2.0 - Artificial Intelligence Efficiencies • Model Contract Exhibit C – IT General Terms and Conditions, Section WW – GenAI Disclosure and Conditions • Generative Artificial Intelligence Risk Assessment (HBEX 707) Covered California expects the selected bidder to adhere to our Acceptable Use Policy, which will be provided prior to the start of work.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
78.	Is GenAI acceptable for analytics support, documentation, or data quality processes? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Section 4.1.3 – GenAI	Covered California has documented GenAI response requirements and looks forward to reviewing any intended implementation in Proposer's solution(s). See also: • RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0, Sections 3.4.1, 3.4.4, and 6 • Template K – Project Work Plan and Schedule, Section 2.0 - Artificial Intelligence Efficiencies • Model Contract Exhibit C – IT General Terms and Conditions, Section WW – GenAI Disclosure and Conditions • Generative Artificial Intelligence Risk Assessment (HBEX 707)

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
79.	Are there specific governance or approval requirements for introducing GenAI capabilities? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Section 4.1.3 – GenAI	Covered California has documented GenAI response requirements and looks forward to reviewing any intended implementation in Proposer's solution(s). New GenAI capabilities are subject to review and approval by Covered California. See also: • RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0, Sections 3.4.1, 3.4.4, and 6 • Template K – Project Work Plan and Schedule, Section 2.0 - Artificial Intelligence Efficiencies • Model Contract Exhibit C – IT General Terms and Conditions, Section WW – GenAI Disclosure and Conditions • Generative Artificial Intelligence Risk Assessment (HBEX 707) The selected bidder must comply with Covered California's Acceptable Use Policy which includes submitting and gaining approval when using any GenAI tools. The bidder must include the completed HBEX707 with submission and submit a new/updated HBEX707 when introducing GenAI that modifies or changes the originally approved HBEX707.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
80.	What level of ongoing operational support is expected from the vendor? Model Contract – Exhibit A - [D. General Scope or Tasks, 7. Maintenance and] Operations	Covered California has described the required M&O support throughout the RFP documents, including: • Model Contract Exhibit A – Scope of Work, D. General Scope or Tasks, 7. Maintenance and Operations, G. Key Project Personnel, and I. Contractor's Roles and Responsibilities • Template G – Functional Requirements • Template H – Functional Requirements Approach • Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirements • Template J – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirements Approach • Template K – Project Work Plan and Schedule • Template N – Cost Workbook, 3. Maintenance & Operations
81.	Are there predefined service level expectations for availability, performance, or issue resolution? Model Contract – Exhibit A; Exhibit B Service Levels	See Template I – Project Management, Implementation, Performance, and Security Requirements PM.05 – 07 (issue resolution) and SP.01 – 13 (availability and performance).
82.	Does Department of Healthcare Services (DHCS) or State-run Medicaid Organization count as Multi-payer business definition? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Section 5.0; Templates A, MQ1 -	Yes.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
83.	MQ2 - If the proposer has performed Data Services for organization related to Hospitals or Physicians, can it be substituted for claims/enrollment data services ? Can we request MQ2 language be changed to "Client base: Proposer claims/enrollment or other health data services clients account for a minimum of 10 million lives" RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Section 5.0; Templates A, MQ2 -	Proposer that "has performed Data Services for organization related to Hospitals or Physicians" [sic] cannot claim to have fulfilled Minimum Qualification #2 if those services did not involve claims/enrollment data. Covered California will not change this minimum qualification's wording.
84.	Will the desirable qualifications of either subcontractor or prime suffice? Do both the prime and subcontractor have to meet the desirable qualification separately? RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0 Section 5.2; Templates A & B	Proposer may satisfy any desirable qualifications in whole or in part through its Subcontractor(s) qualifications, provided that the subcontractor arrangement is not severable during the term of the contract unless mutually agreed to by Covered California and the Proposer. It is not necessary that both Proposer and Subcontractor(s) satisfy all desirable qualifications separately.
85.	The RFP states that emailed submissions must be sent "with 'RFP 2025-06' in the subject line." Can Covered California please clarify whether proposers are allowed to include additional content (e.g., proposer name, proposal title) in the subject line as well? RFP Section 1.10 – Format of Proposals (Page 7)	Yes, proposers may include additional content in the subject line.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
86.	The RFP states that proposers must "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 Covered California please confirm whether proposers are permitted to use a smaller font size in figures and tables? RFP Section 1.11.1 – Narrative Format, requirement #1 (Page 7)	No, 12-point font should be used in all responses.
87.	Related to the same RFP requirement to use a font "of at least 12-point size throughout," can Covered California please confirm whether proposers are permitted to use a smaller font size in the header and footer? RFP Section 1.11.1 – Narrative Format, requirement #1 (Page 7)	No, 12-point font should be used in all responses.
88.	The RFP states that proposers must "sequentially number the pages in each section and clearly identify each section in the order requested." Can Covered California please clarify whether vendors should number pages sequentially across the entire response or restart the numbering at the start of each section? RFP Section 1.11.1 – Narrative Format, requirement #3 (Page 7)	Proposers must restart the numbering at the start of each section.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
89.	The RFP states that proposers must "place the Proposer organization's name in a header or footer on every page. If the Proposer's name is not already entered elsewhere on a completed certification or form, add it to a header, footer, or signature block." Can Covered California please clarify the latter part of this requirement? For example, if the Proposer's name is on the last page of a form in the signature block but does not appear on the form's preceding pages, would Covered California like the Proposer to add their name to the form's original header/footer on these earlier pages? RFP Section 1.11.1 – Narrative Format, requirement #4 (Page 8)	No, a Proposer is not required to add its name to the form's original header/footer as long as the Proposer's name is listed on one of the form's pages.
90.	The RFP states that proposals "must be divided into two appropriately labeled folders marked 'Technical Proposal' and 'Administrative Requirements.'" Since email restrictions preclude the attachment of folders, can Covered California please confirm whether it is acceptable to submit the documents intended for separate folders via separate emails? RFP Section 3.1 – Format of Proposal Packages (Page 16)	Yes, we recommend zip files, but multiple emails are allowable. Please be clear in your email that this is 1 of 2, etc.
91.	If a proposer utilizes a subcontractor that is certified as both a Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) and a Small Business (SB), can Covered California please confirm that the single subcontractor will be recognized in both incentive/preference categories? RFP Section 6 – Preference and Incentive Programs (Pages 27–32)	Yes, a subcontractor certified as both a DVBE and SB would be recognized in both incentive / preference categories, assuming the Proposer satisfies all other applicable requirements in RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0, 6. Preference and Incentive Programs.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
92.	If the answer to the preceding question is affirmative (i.e., a subcontractor certified as both a DVBE and a SB will be recognized in both preference/incentive categories), can Covered California please confirm whether that subcontractor – if allocated 25% of the total contract value – will be eligible to simultaneously receive both the 5% DVBE participation incentive and the 25% SB participation preference when scoring? RFP Section 6 – Preference and Incentive Programs (Pages 27–32)	Yes, the subcontractor in this example would be recognized in Table 6's "25% SB Subcontractor Participation (5% Preference)" and "DVBE Subcontractor Participation (5% Incentive maximum)" categories, assuming the Proposer satisfies all other applicable requirements in RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0, 6. Preference and Incentive Programs.
93.	Can Covered California please clarify whether the "additional detail of costs" referenced on page 19, Section 3.3.13 of the RFP refers to the level of detail provided in Template N – Cost Workbook, Tab 2 (One-Time Implementation) and Tab 3 (Maintenance & Operations), or if a further cost breakdown is required?	Template N – Cost Workbook provides the necessary level of detail.
94.	Could Covered California please clarify what they mean by normalized data on page 6 of exhibit A?	Data populated into a relational database management system (RDBMS) at the center of the Proposer's solution(s).

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
95.	Regarding [Model Contract] Exhibit A [-Scope of Work, D. General Scope or Tasks,] 4.f Integrated Benchmarks and Indices, which of the indices specified in template G (i.e. which of AG2 Transformation Delivery" (requirements AG2.04, AG2.08, AG2.14, AG2.15), "CA Common Analytics" (requirement CA.02), and "QA Prvdr Qlty & Aud." (requirement QA.07, QA.10)) does HEI 2.0 currently incorporate?	HEI 2.0 currently incorporates the following: • AG2.04 • AG2.08 (partially, including HPI) • AG2.14 (Merative MarketScan) • AG2.15 (Medicare reference pricing) • CA.02 (partially) • QA.07 • QA.10 Not currently incorporated in HEI 2.0 are: • AG2.08 (CA major geographic regions, State and federal legislative districts, SVI, and ADI) • AG2.14 (HCCI, CMS Enrollee-Level EDGE LDS and RxDC) • AG2.15 (Medicaid, i.e., Medi-Cal, reference pricing) • CA.02 (metropolitan areas, State and federal legislative districts) Implementation within HEI 2.0 does not relieve the Proposer from implementing these same capabilities separately in its own solution(s).
96.	How and in what format are health plans accustomed to sharing data with the current HEI 2.0 contractor?	Issuers submit sequential data files via SFTP to a location designated and controlled by the HEI 2.0 Vendor. Covered California expects a similar data transmission and receipt process supplied by the Proposer. See Template G – Functional Requirement AG1.01 and Procurement Library for HEI 2.0 data extract and submission formats and specifications.
97.	Can Covered California confirm if they expect the folders 'Technical Proposal' and 'Administrative Requirements' to be submitted as zip files attached to the email?	Yes, zip files are preferred.

No.	Bidder Questions:	Covered CA - Response:
98.	If the files are too large to be delivered in one email, is it acceptable for the offeror to submit the proposal through multiple emails?	Yes, we recommend zip files, but multiple emails are allowable. Please be clear in your email that this is 1 of 2, etc.
99.	Are offerors allowed to split one key personnel role among two staff, so as to meet the FTE and role requirements while being resource efficient?	Yes.
100.	Does Exhibit A Attachment 1 - Work Authorization need to be filled out or is that to be filled out only if awarded the contract? Exhibit A, Attachment 1 - Work Authorization.docx	This is only to be filled out if awarded the contract.
101.	For the Technical Proposal, can we collate all of the WORD documents into a single PDF document, and submit the EXCEL documents as separate documents? Format of Proposal Packages	Proposer may combine all Technical Proposal MS Word-based response templates into a single PDF document and submit the three MS Excel-based response templates individually. For Model Contract exhibits, refer to RFP 2025-06 HEI 3.0, Section 4.1.2.