



**California Health and Human Services Agency
Office of Technology & Solutions Integration
California Healthcare Eligibility, Enrollment, and Retention
System (CalHEERS)
2329 Gateway Oaks, Suite 250
Sacramento, CA 95833**



October 31, 2025

Attached is the CalHEERS SDMO RFP # 73040873, Responses Release 01. This list includes the comprehensive list of the questions received by the State as of 1:00pm PT on 10/29/25.

New to Release 01:

ID 6 – ID 73

The assigned ID numbers are system generated, please note that ID's 1-5 were used for testing.

Submitted items have been categorized by type:

Q = Question

RFC = Request for Change

RFA = Request for Artifact

Sincerely,

Alina Corpus
Procurement Official

ID	RFP Section	RFP Subsection	Bidder Ques or RFC	QA-State Response	Type	Release Response
6	_RFP 6 - Bidder Requirements	6.0 BIDDER REQUIREMENTS	Requirements in RFP section 6.5 require a cost estimate for proposed solutions. When the State releases the Cost Workbook, will it include placeholders for these costs?	The State updated the instructions for RFP Section 8.5 VOLUME III – COST DATA, to identify where the cost component of U&A Rqmt 6.5-2 & 6.5-3 should be placed in the bidder's response. In accordance with RFP 8.6.3 - Electronic Proposal Format and Searchability. Please see Addendum 1.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
7	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-4 Instructions	APPENDIX D-4 appears to omit services and sizing. For example: a) The Elastic Block Storage (EBS) 361,890 bytes listed appears low for CalHEERS transaction volume. b) The services do not include items such as AWS CloudWatch, ElastiCache, or CloudFront. Can the State confirm that all detailed specifications of the required AWS infrastructure are published within the RFP, including: a. The full list of AWS services to be used in the project b. Sizing details (types and quantities of EC2 instances, allocated storage, etc.)	Please see Ref Doc# S1018 - Cloud Hosting Data Center Services Supporting Data, in the Bidders' Library: - The State has updated the Elastic Block Storage (EBS) table to reflect correctly on Page 2 of Ref Doc# S1018 in the Bidders' Library. - The State has provided a full list of Cloud Services on Page 5 of Ref Doc# S1018 in the Bidders' Library. - The State has provided Sizing Details on Page 6 of Ref Doc# S1018 in the Bidders' Library.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
8	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-4 SDMO Cloud Hosting Costs	APPENDIX D-4.1 appears to omit services and sizing. Can the State confirm that all detailed specifications of the required infrastructure are published within the RFP, including: a. The full list of AWS services to be used in the project b. Specifications of TTEC and Verint infrastructure c. Sizing details (e.g., number of calls per year, annual end customer call minutes, call recording requirements, analytics enablement, recording storage, retrieval and retention)	This request for change is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
9	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-1 Total Cost Summary	We have not received the Cost Workbook as part of the RFP nor is it present in the Bidders Library. Please provide the Cost Workbook.	The Appendix D - Cost Workbook was made available to Bidders via the Bidders' Library on 10/17/2025, and has been updated within Addendum 1.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
10	Appendix B - Forms	A.0 B – FORMS	We have not received the AI Risk Assessment Form as part of the RFP nor is it present in the Bidders Library. Please provide the AI Risk Assessment Form.	The State has provided the AI Risk Assessment Form within the Bidders' Library as of 10/31/2025.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)

ID	RFP Section	RFP Subsection	Bidder Ques or RFC	QA-State Response	Type	Release Response
11	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-3 SDMO Software Costs	The Bidders Library includes additional software currently utilized in the operation of the CalHEERS system which are not included in the list mentioned in the Types of Software as outlined within the RFP section D-3: SDMO Software Costs (excluding Service Center applications). To enable a comprehensive and accurate cost proposal, would the State want to include the following software including its specifications, such as license type, quantities etc., currently in use and not present within cost worksheet D-3: SDMO Software Costs? •Annual Registration Fee for the CalHEERS Internet Number •Go Daddy Website Domain Management •Google Docs AI •Google Maps •Google Analytics •Ping •Infobip •Azure •Netskope •Global Sign •LoadRunner •Google Chronicle •Okta •Palo Alto Prisma Cloud If so, could the State include these applications, and their specifications, as part of the forthcoming Cost Workbook?	This request for change is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
12	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	6.0 OPERATIONS REQUIREMENTS	Would the State consider removing the requirement for data centers in two separate regions, including alternate data center in a geographically separate region at a distance of 100 miles or more from the primary data center.	The State considered this request. Please see Addendum 1.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
13	Appendix A-2 Special Provisions	04.0 TERM	Why 5 year base plus 5 one year options vs. a longer base contract?	It is standard practice for the State to utilize a 5 year base term for large System Integrator Contracts.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
14	() Overall RFP Comment	() Overall RFP Comment	What lessons has CalHEERS' learned looking back at history that you are most interested in addressing with a new vendor/system.	The State has addressed desired modifications within RFP 4 - Proposed System.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
15	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-1 Total Cost Summary	1. Please provide the Native Excel cost files.	The Appendix D - Cost Workbook was made available to Bidders via the Bidders' Library on 10/17/2025, and has been updated within Addendum 1.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
16	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	2.0 CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS	To maximize competition and ensure an equal playing field, please make available a detailed description of the current organization structure, including approximate team sizes - distinguishing between Government and Contractor personnel. Note, a lower level than the current 4 quadrant view in the RFP.	Refer to the Ref Doc #S1015 - Contractor Organizational Charts, within the Bidders' Library.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)

ID	RFP Section	RFP Subsection	Bidder Ques or RFC	QA-State Response	Type	Release Response
18	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	5.0 PROGRAM SUPPORT REQUIREMENTS	Please provide the ticket volumes (Incidents & Service requests) for the following scope areas: 1. Application Management Services (5.8) 2. Salesforce AMS (5.6) Please include an extract of incidents, service requests, problems and change requests for preceding 12 months.	This request for an artifact is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
19	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-1 Total Cost Summary	TIP 2 Pricing is for 24 months in Appendix D-8, but in the Cost Summary tab - the cell for TIP 2 Yr 2 is greyed out. Where would be the price for TIP 2 Yr 2 be accounted for?	The State updated Appendix D-1- Total Cost Summary, worksheet to sum both Year 1 and Year 2 costs associated with Transition-In (TIP1 & TIP2) Costs. Please see Addendum 1.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
20	_RFP 9 - Evaluation	9.0 EVALUATION	We understand the State's goal in this procurement is to get the best value possible by obtaining lowest pricing from highly qualified vendors. Highly qualified vendors would likely score very similarly on the non-cost technical components of the bid, so please consider the following change to the evaluation scoring system: Change the current a 5-point scale (100%, 75%, 50%, 25%, 0%) to a 11-point scale as follows: 100%, 90%, 80%, 70%, 60%, 50%, 40%, 30%, 20%, 10%, 0). Adding granularity to the model would tighten the score between the most qualified vendors. This would enable lower price to play a much larger role in the overall evaluation. On other State procurements the State has been forced to buy from the higher priced vendor even though the real technical differences were close as a result of the current scoring rubric.	The State considered this approach and decided on the requirements as published in RFP #73040873.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
21	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	5.0 PROGRAM SUPPORT REQUIREMENTS	BOT Services - Provide a catalogue and information around 1. # of BOTS implemented 2. # and List of Workflows automated 3. % of new BOTS on an average implemented in the environment 4. Complexity distribution of the BOTS 5. Supervised (Business owned & managed) vs unsupervised (Technology owned) 6. Average # of BOTS and/or workflows enhanced/modified every month 7. Average # of tickets or BOT failures observed in the environment	This request for an artifact is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
22	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-7 Instructions	Please provide the monthly billed hours for System Changes, ideally by role, for onshore and offshore for the last 5 years.	Please see Appendix D-7 - Onshore System Change Costs, and Appendix D-7.2 Offshore System Change Costs, where the State has projected the effort for System Changes by role for the term of the Contract.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)

ID	RFP Section	RFP Subsection	Bidder Ques or RFC	QA-State Response	Type	Release Response
23	_RFP 3 - Current System	3.0 CURRENT SYSTEM	CalHEERS has the following text in the RFP "The CalHEERS Database Design is a combination of materials, data and information, some of which is proprietary to the current SI. All components of design that are not proprietary are available for review in the Bidders' Library." How would the state like non-incumbent vendors to approach transition, ongoing operations and related effort estimation of the solution components whose database design is proprietary to the existing System Integrator? What assumptions can the non-incumbent vendors make related to these proprietary database designs?	This request for change is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
24	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-7 Instructions	The State seeks a best-value, transparent, high quality, and high productivity solution. State Agencies such as FTB have moved towards evaluation models that facilitate this goal by asking bidders to share risks and rewards with the State. They encourage bidders to offer creative productivity and gain sharing solutions as alternatives to traditional pricing models. The current RFP allocates 30% of the Cost Evaluation - or 10% of the total evaluation - to the cost of system changes. The RFP uses a prescriptive, role-based pricing model with pre-defined hours, per role, across the 10-year duration of the program. This model encourages bidders to offer the cheapest possible rates to maximize the score for one of the largest and most critical aspects of the CalHEERS program. This approach does not reflect the evolving landscape of technology-enabled delivery, particularly with the emergence of Generative AI (GenAI) and other automation tools. Lastly, this pricing model assumes uniform productivity across vendors, minimizing innovation and efficiency - in direct conflict with the CalHEERS vision, procurement objectives and best value. We recommend the state allow vendors to submit optional pricing alternatives in the cost sheets. These alternatives should be proposed by the vendors as their best thinking on ways to increase value to you. To maintain the current procurement schedule, these alternatives would only be evaluated and discussed during negotiations and confidential discussions. If a bidder's concepts are deemed valuable to the State after negotiations, the RFP could then be amended so that all vendors could propose in BAFO to the same model, thus enabling a fair procurement while facilitating innovation.	The State has considered this approach and decided on the requirements as published in RFP #73040873.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
25	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	6.0 OPERATIONS REQUIREMENTS	Can you please confirm that Service Desk is in scope to support Calheers' internal userbase. If Service Desk is required, can you please provide the following details: - Where is the Service Desk price to be allocated in the pricing sheet? - Total number of end users supported by Service Desk - Total contacts expected per month to the Service Desk - Hours of support - Language requirements - Breakout of contacts by channel (Phone, email, chat and web portal) - Number of TFN and the monthly average minutes consumed for inbound and outbound calls	This question is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)

ID	RFP Section	RFP Subsection	Bidder Ques or RFC	QA-State Response	Type	Release Response
26	_RFP 3 - Current System	3.0 CURRENT SYSTEM	What is the current status of the transition from MARS-e to ARC-AMPE? If transition has started, can you quantify how many POAM's remain open?	This question is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
27	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	6.0 OPERATIONS REQUIREMENTS	Within the context of Desktop Support specified in Help Desk Services (Section 6.16), would the Contractor be leveraging an existing Windows image, packaged applications, and System Center Configuration Manager (SCCM) solution provided and maintained by State to support desktops and laptops? If a separate environment to be managed by the Contractor for CalHEERS, please share: - Number of OS images to be maintained - Number of applications to be packaged and deployed - Expected number of users to be supported	This question is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
28	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	Exhibit A – System Requirements Specification	There are 415 pages of requirements in "Appendix A-4 - SOW Exhibit A - System Requirements Specification" - Please clarify the requirements that reflect the functionality currently supported in the CalHEERS system excluding depreciated functionality. For instance - Requirements 44458, 44731, 44732, and 44736 seem to relate to SHOP that is no longer in scope of CalHEERS	This question is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
29	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-3 SDMO Software Costs	Please provide a list of software components and volumes related to the current Service Center technology stack to be included in Contractor's proposal	This question is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
30	_RFP 4 - Proposed System	4.0 PROPOSED SYSTEM	What are the current LLMs in use at CALHEERS? Will it fair to assume will that LLM be made available to us for consumption in our services or should we include that as part of our costing?	While CalHEERS is currently reviewing AI solutions that will include LLMs for near-term implementation, the State identifies that there are no LLMs currently deployed on CalHEERS today.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
31	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	6.0 OPERATIONS REQUIREMENTS	Please provide details about the technology stack for Service Center Services: 1) Other than Amazon Connect and Verint, what other systems and tools are used 2) How many TFNs are maintained for the Service Center? Are these TFNs provided by AWS as part of Amazon Connect Service? 3) Is the expectation for the Contractor to include cloud service cost for the number of minutes consumed? If yes, please share monthly inbound and outbound minutes 4) Please share other AWS components and associated volumetrics (example: S3 storage for call and screen recording) as part of the Technology stack 5) Other than phone, what other channels are supported by the Service Center. Please provide volume of contacts by each channel and associated technology stack details. 6) How many Service Center agents are supported today. Please share average and peak number of agents.	This request for change is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
32	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-4 SDMO Cloud Hosting Costs	Cloud Hosting Data Center Services inventory tables included in Appendix D-4 use different unit of measures for storage components (example: Elastic Block Store in Bytes, Snapshot size in Bytes, Elastic File Store in KBs, Relational Database Service in Bytes). Please confirm that these unit of measures are accurate. If not, please share these tables with appropriate unit of measure.	The State provides updated data within Ref Doc# S1018 - Cloud Hosting Data Center Services Supporting Data, which is located in the Bidders' Library, where the State converted all values, except EC2, to megabytes (MBs). EC2 values are in gigabytes (GBs).	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)

ID	RFP Section	RFP Subsection	Bidder Ques or RFC	QA-State Response	Type	Release Response
33	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-4 SDMO Cloud Hosting Costs	What are the various flavors of databases for 28 RDSDB? Please provide a breakdown of number of RDS DBs by technology (e.g. x Oracle RDS, y MySQL RDS, z MSSQL RDS).	The State has provided the breakdown as requested in a table on Page 5 of Ref Doc# S1018 - Cloud Hosting Data Center Services Supporting Data, which can be found in the Bidders' Library.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
34	_RFP 4 - Proposed System	4.0 PROPOSED SYSTEM	This section indicates the State has made several updates under the Change Management and Configuration Management areas to delineate between security changes they consider modernization versus mandatory changes. Can the State provide more detail on how they differentiate between security modernization vs mandatory change?	RFP 4.4.4 - Updates to Change Management and Configuration Management, bullet # 7, refers to the updates applied to SOW Section 6.7 System Security.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
35	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	6.0 OPERATIONS REQUIREMENTS	Which AWS Regions are currently being used for primary cloud data center and alternate data center?	CalHEERS currently utilizes two (2) availability zones as primary and secondary cloud data centers and utilize a third availability zone to store data and conduct TR simulation exercises, all within a US West region of AWS services. Additionally, CalHEERS maintains a database backup and codebase repository backup within a separate US West region of AWS services.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
36	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	Introduction	Can the State please provide an Excel version of Appendix D, COST WORKBOOK?	The Appendix D - Cost Workbook was made available to Bidders via the Bidders' Library on 10/17/2025, and has been updated within Addendum 1.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
37	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	6.0 OPERATIONS REQUIREMENTS	Understanding that State uses Flexera for Asset Management, can the supplier leverage this tool for this requirement and that it provides the functionality for discovery, tracking, and compliance management for all Compute, Storage, and Network IT assets, both hardware and software?	Bidders are responsible to bring an Asset Management Software (AMS) that complies with the Requirements of the RFP.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
38	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-4 SDMO Cloud Hosting Costs	While the number of S3 buckets provided in Appendix D, it does not contain amount of S3 storage utilized. Please share utilization details for S3 buckets.	This request for change is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
39	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	6.0 OPERATIONS REQUIREMENTS	Is 2329 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suites 100 & 250, Sacramento, CA 95833, the only worksite eligible for lease takeover? In requirement 6.18.2-22, it mentions "other Project worksites", are there other sites that need to be managed and maintained?	This question is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
40	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	6.0 OPERATIONS REQUIREMENTS	6.2.2-04 states that "The Contractor shall provide for, at a minimum, 1000 concurrent users for the automated Service Desk management tool." Please confirm whether the requirement is to support a minimum of 1000 total users at the CalHEERS Service Desk or to expect a minimum of 1000 users concurrently contacting the Service Desk.	The State confirms that, as stated within SOW Rqmt 6.2.2-04, the automated Service Desk management tool must be able to support a minimum of 1,000 concurrent users.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
41	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	6.0 OPERATIONS REQUIREMENTS	Please provide details about the current network technology stack including device volumetrics, circuits, locations, and other relevant details for relevant Project Worksites: 1. Routers and Switches 2. Virtual PrivateNetwork (VPN) connections 3. Internet connections 4. Private/dedicated circuits 5. Wireless Access Points 6. Wireless LAN controllers 7. LAN/WAN/MAN	This question is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)

ID	RFP Section	RFP Subsection	Bidder Ques or RFC	QA-State Response	Type	Release Response
42	_RFP 8 - Proposal & Bid Format	8.0 PROSPAL FORMAT	May Bidders remove the existing RFP page numbers, headers, and footers from Appendix B Forms so that we may be consistent in our proposal markings and compliant with RFP instructions for page numbering of our proposal? Also, there are required forms that have different margins smaller than the State's 1" requirement for proposal response documents (e.g., Appendix B-6, Appendix B-16). Would the State consider allowing Bidders to apply a 3/4" margin on all page sides and allowing us to adjust the margins on forms to be consistent where possible?	The State confirms that bidders can remove the Headers & Footers off of forms for the development of their response and make necessary margin adjustments to maintain compliance with the RFP's formatting requirements.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
43	_RFP 6 - Bidder Requirements	6.0 BIDDER REQUIREMENTS	Would the State consider changing the qualification window from "the past (10) years" to the past (15) years for MQ3 for the Project Manager role? This change will allow for the greatest pool of highly qualified candidates with relevant experience in healthcare exchanges to fulfill Key Staff Roles and bring best value to the State.	The State considered this request. Please see Addendum 1.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
44	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	6.0 OPERATIONS REQUIREMENTS	Under Roles and Responsibilities in Table 6-51: Hosting Services Plan (CD-6.17-1), it mentions cloud hosting for AWS and Google. Can you please provide a list of assets with details for Google Cloud?	This question is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
45	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	6.0 OPERATIONS REQUIREMENTS	Can you please provide a copy of the most current lease for the Project Worksites in scope?	This request for an artifact is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
46	_RFP 4 - Proposed System	4.0 PROPOSED SYSTEM	Is the State using the term "effort driven scheduling" to mean Fixed Work tasks? If yes, can the State clarify what types of activities in the project schedule they would like to use effort driven scheduling for?	This question is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
47	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-2 SDMO Hardware Costs	Within Appendix D-2 SDMO Hardware Cost, there are 712 servers listed in line # 42, 43, and 44 with a Location of "Amazon Web Services". Are these servers in addition to what are provided later on page 1402 & 1403 (Appendix D-4)? If yes, please provide the details of these servers (cpu, memory, storage, etc.).	This question is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
48	_RFP 6 - Bidder Requirements	6.0 BIDDER REQUIREMENTS	Can the State provide documentation or examples of the current Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) process used by the State?	No, the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) process will be implemented with the new Contract.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
49	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	Exhibit A – System Requirements Specification	Requirements 39643 - 39794 indicate functionality provided by GI. Can the State confirm if these are still accurate requirements or provide the updated requirements to identify who or what is providing this functionality today?	This question is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
50	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	4.0 SYSTEM CHANGE & ENHANCEMENTS	Can the State provide the most current version of D-4.8-1 - Business Change Management and OCM Plan?	This request for an artifact is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
51	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	4.0 SYSTEM CHANGE & ENHANCEMENTS	In Section 8.2.12.2 Change Management Methodology, pg 51, it references a link to the current OCM process. Can the linked document be provided?	This request for an artifact is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
52	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	4.0 SYSTEM CHANGE & ENHANCEMENTS	Can the list of Tools on Pg 23 - 29 be unredacted?	This request for an artifact is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
53	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	4.0 SYSTEM CHANGE & ENHANCEMENTS	In section 2.3 SDLC Release Types of the current SDLC Plan, can the State provide more details on the Agile release pilot program on Pg 7? The information is currently redacted.	Yes, the State will provide the latest version of the D-4.2-1 – SDLC Plan, in the Bidders' Library which will provide the requested data.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
54	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	3.0 PROJECT MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS	Section 9.9 Customer Satisfaction Survey, Pg 42 references an annual satisfaction survey of the Customer Service Representatives. Can the State provide the results of the latest survey?	CalHEERS has not conducted a Customer Service Representative Survey under the current Contract. The Survey services are being reconstituted on the project under the new Contract.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)

ID	RFP Section	RFP Subsection	Bidder Ques or RFC	QA-State Response	Type	Release Response
55	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-3 SDMO Software Costs	Please provide a detailed and comprehensive list of software, applications, version numbers, and support levels be provided? Examples include but are not limited to: Amazon / AWS line items need additional details Atlassian has Data Center and 3 different Cloud versions	This request for change is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
56	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	3.0 PROJECT MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS	The outline for Del CD-3.3-1 Cost Management Plan includes a section for managing costs for the Provider Directory. Can the State confirm the vendor responsibility for managing costs begins with the receipt of files from the Provider Directory vendor (Lexis Nexus)?	This question is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
57	Appendix A-2 Special Provisions	ATTACHMENT A-2.3 SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS (SLA) & LIQUIDATED DAMAGES	Can the State provide the most recent 12 months of historical SLA performance, definitions and associated targets.	This request for an artifact is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
58	Appendix A-4 Statement Of Work	3.0 PROJECT MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS	Section 9.3 Process Improvement Approach on Pg 38 of the deliverable references a CalHEERS Change Process Improvement (CPI) Register. Can the State provide the current register in the bidder's library?	This request for an artifact is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
59	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-1 Total Cost Summary	Can CALHEERS provide term dates (start/end) for all of the hardware, software, and cloud services?	This question is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
60	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-2 SDMO Hardware Costs	What is the current timeline for hardware refresh across the enterprise?	This question is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
61	_RFP 4 - Proposed System	4.0 PROPOSED SYSTEM	What are the LLMs currently in use today on CALHEERS? Could you provide examples of Agentic AI based use cases already deployed for Managed Services and System Changes?	CalHEERS does not currently have any LLMs implemented today. CalHEERS is currently reviewing Gen AI solutions that will include LLMs for near-term implementation.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
62	_RFP 6 - Bidder Requirements	6.0 BIDDER REQUIREMENTS	Agile Manager Role: MQ#2 requires 2 years in the last 5 but per the scoring methodology the candidate would get no points for meeting the qualification and "one point for each additional year of experience". Following that logic for this MQ the candidate can get scores of 0, 1, 2, 3 but the max score is 5. How should this MQ be scored?	Pertaining to the accrual of additional years of experience in general - The State identifies that the possibility for accruing "additional years of experience" is not limited by the timeframe in which the minimum experience must have occurred. Application to RFP 6, MQ# 6.3.1-54 - The formula is [2 yrs minimum within the last 5yrs] + up to 5 years of additional experience for potential points.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
63	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-2 SDMO Hardware Costs	Please provide a detailed description of existing hardware (e.g., CPU / RAM / Storage / Connectivity (Network / Storage area network (SAN))	This request for change is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)

ID	RFP Section	RFP Subsection	Bidder Ques or RFC	QA-State Response	Type	Release Response
64	_RFP 6 - Bidder Requirements	6.0 BIDDER REQUIREMENTS	Data Analytics Expert Role: MQ#3 requires 3 years in the last 7, but per the scoring methodology the candidate would get no points for meeting the qualification and "one point for each additional year of experience". Following that logic for this MQ the candidate can get scores of 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 but the max score is 5. How should this MQ be scored?	Pertaining to the accrual of additional years of experience in general - The State identifies that the possibility for accruing "additional years of experience" is not limited by the timeframe in which the minimum experience must have occurred. Application to RFP 6, MQ# 6.3.1-64 (MQ# 6.3.1-63 within Addendum 1) – The formula is [3 yrs minimum within the last 7yrs] + up to 5 years of additional experience for potential points.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
65	_RFP 6 - Bidder Requirements	6.0 BIDDER REQUIREMENTS	Should 6.4-16 point 3 be re-written to align with the section regarding assisted consumer journey? Currently reads: "How consumer journey will integrate with data management and AI innovations"	This request for change is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
66	_RFP 6 - Bidder Requirements	6.0 BIDDER REQUIREMENTS	Consumer Experience Lead Role: MQ#1 requires 7 years in the last 10, but per the scoring methodology the candidate would get no points for meeting the qualification and "one point for each additional year of experience". Following that logic for this MQ the candidate can get scores of 0, 1, 2, 3 but the max score is 5. How should this MQ be scored?	Pertaining to the accrual of additional years of experience in general - The State identifies that the possibility for accruing "additional years of experience" is not limited by the timeframe in which the minimum experience must have occurred. Application to RFP 6, MQ# 6.3.1-76 (Renumbered in Addendum 1 as MQ# 6.3.1-75) - The formula is [7 yrs minimum within the last 10yrs] + up to 5 years of additional experience for potential points.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
67	_RFP 6 - Bidder Requirements	6.0 BIDDER REQUIREMENTS	Can the state delete the Mandatory Scorable Requirement "The Agile Manager shall have two (2) years' experience writing the back-ends of modern web applications (e.g., using frameworks such as Ruby on Rails, Django, Flask, or Express) and front-ends of modern web applications (e.g., using a modern JavaScript front-end framework such as React, Vue, Ember, or Backbone; using modern web standards-compliant CSS and HTML)"?	The State considered this request. Please see Addendum 1.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
68	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-3 SDMO Software Costs	There are many line items of Red Hat OpenShift Container platform. How many containers are in the environment that need to be supported?	This question is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	Q	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
69	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-4 SDMO Cloud Hosting Costs	Can the State please ensure that the most current versions of each plan in Figure 2 SDLC Plan Deliverable Hierarchy Diagram on Pg 10 of the SDLC Plan Deliverable are included in the bidder's library?	This request for an artifact is under review and the State will provide a response in a future Q&A.	RFA	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
70	_RFP 6 - Bidder Requirements	6.0 BIDDER REQUIREMENTS	The total number of Key Staff requested and the associated mandatory requirements for these positions materially restrict competition and new ways of working, while simultaneously providing a substantial advantage to the incumbent. Of particular concern is Project Manager - MQ# 6.3.1-3. The total years of experience combined with recent eligibility/enrollment experience describes a resource that likely only exists within CalHEERS. For example, James Gnesda, the optimal candidate for this role, does not meet all these combined requirements. Expanding the experience window to the last 15 years would allow us to propose a qualified candidate familiar with CalHEERS and its ecosystem.	The State considered this request. Please see Addendum 1.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)

ID	RFP Section	RFP Subsection	Bidder Ques or RFC	QA-State Response	Type	Release Response
71	Appendix D - Cost Workbook	D-7 Onshore Sys Chg Costs	Allocating 1000 cost points to System Changes (D7) for what is in essence a rate card for undefined future scope creates a distorted evaluation model. This approach gives the incumbent an advantage due to their understanding of current inflight System Changes, the two-year CalHEERS roadmap, and the future pipeline of changes working through the change process. Lastly, given the dynamic changes coming with Generative AI, the rate card will change materially in the very near future, rendering moot any evaluation based on the continuation of the current roles for the next decade. Industry would value a decomposition of the actual hours, roles, and rates used for the past three years of System Changes. This would clarify how the requested hours increased fourfold from the 2018 solicitation and how these changes will impact future Operations/Program Support.	The State considered this request and has decided to keep the approach identified within RFP #73040873.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
72	_RFP 7 - Cost Instructions	2.0 RULES GOVERNING COMPETITION	The restriction on subcontractor profit is inconsistent with the RFP terms. A full and open procurement lets the market correctly determine a fair and reasonable price. From the terms: All subcontracts shall be in writing and available upon request by the State; provided however that the Contractor shall have the right to redact pricing and other sensitive and proprietary information prior to making the subcontract available to the State.	The State considered this request. Please see Addendum 1.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)
73	_RFP 1 - Introduction & Overview	1.0 INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW	Accenture request a six-week extension to 15 February 2026. The Bidder's Library is still being populated, and answers to questions submitted prior to the bidder's conference have yet to be provided. Further, the Government's schedule indicates final question responses won't be available until 12/3, leaving little time to incorporate any changes.	The State considered this request and has provided updated Key Actions Dates within Addendum 1 to the RFP.	RFC	Release 01 (10/31/2025)