SENIORCRE® • RFP TEMPLATE

Modern Senior Housing & Care Technology RFP

Requirement language an operator can issue to any vendor, including SeniorCRE — written so answers are testable rather than aspirational.

RFP template • September 8, 2026

Status as of September 8, 2026. SeniorCRE has no completed operator pilot and no operator production deployment. Capability statements in this document carry an explicit maturity label: BUILT means shipped in main and exercised in SeniorCRE-operated validation environments with synthetic data, not available to users and not in production; FRAMEWORK means the data model and surfaces exist but the behaviour a reader might assume from the name is not enforced; ROADMAP means not built.

No named third-party system is connected in operator production. Any third-party name that appears is used nominatively to describe the system category an operator already runs, never to assert an integration.

Figures labelled illustrative are worked examples on stated assumptions, not measured results, not benchmarks, and not forecasts. Nothing in this document is a warranty, a delivery date, a clinical or regulatory fitness statement, or investment advice.

How to use this template

Issue these requirements to every vendor under consideration, SeniorCRE included, and require each answer to carry a build state — shipped and in production for named customers, shipped but not production-proven, or not built — with the evidence that supports it. A requirement without an evidence class is an invitation to overstate.

The governing question: which number governs?

Ask five leaders in the same operating company what occupancy was last Tuesday and you will often get five defensible answers. The census system counts a resident from move-in. Billing counts from the first billable day. The clinical record counts from the first documented assessment. The pipeline counts a signed agreement. The board deck counts whatever was pasted into it. Each system is internally correct.

The failure is not bad data. It is unassigned authority. Nobody has declared, in writing and in the system, which definition governs a decision, which source may state the number, what happens when sources disagree, and how the answer can be traced afterwards.

Not every disagreement is bad data. Two systems can both be right under different definitions. Three categories are worth separating: a definition conflict, where the same word is measured differently; a timing conflict, where systems are correct as of different moments; and a defect, where one system is simply wrong. Only the third is a data-quality problem. The first two are governance problems, and they do not resolve by buying another integration.

Definition requirements

- Describe how a governed figure's population, clock, inclusions, exclusions, version, and owner are stored and changed.
- Show how a definition change is versioned and how prior reporting remains reproducible.

Authority requirements

- Show where an operator declares which system may state a figure, for which period, granted by which role.
- Show what happens to a value submitted by a system that has not been granted authority.

Reconciliation requirements

- Show tolerance, tie-break, escalation owner, and where an override justification is recorded.
- Show how a definition conflict, a timing conflict, and a defect are distinguished, since only the third is a data-quality problem.

Lineage requirements

- Trace a reported figure to its source rows, rules, and timestamps in the product, without a manual rebuild.
- Show the immutable audit record for who changed a definition, a grant, or an override, and when.

AI and agent requirements

- Show where the operator declares what any agent may read, act on, and must escalate — and how absence of a grant is enforced as a denial.
- State plainly which agent actions are autonomous, which are decision-support, and which are not built.

Claims discipline

- Require every named integration to be identified as production for named customers or not.
- Require every outcome figure to arrive with formula, sources, date, and limits.
- Require every medication safety control to be identified as enforced, advisory, or not built.

SeniorCRE's own answers, in short

Definitions, authority, reconciliation, lineage, and agent-authority grants are BUILT and exercised in SeniorCRE-operated validation environments with synthetic data. Third-party ingestion is FRAMEWORK, with no named system connected in operator production. Medication safety enforcement is ROADMAP. There is no completed operator pilot and no operator production deployment as of September 8, 2026.

Definition. Authority. Reconciliation. Lineage.

Those four are what make data governable. A definition says what the number means. Source authority says which system may state it. Reconciliation says what happens when systems disagree. Lineage says how the number can be traced back through every hand it passed through.

Govern first. Replace only by choice. Operators can govern the systems they retain or assign selected system-of-record functions to SeniorCRE. The operator chooses the architecture.

When systems disagree, the operator governs.

SeniorCRE is a registered trademark of SeniorCRE, LLC. Operator Authority Chain™ is a trademark of SeniorCRE, LLC. This document is informational. It is not an offer, a warranty, a service commitment, a clinical or regulatory fitness statement, or investment advice.

https://seniorcre.com • Request an Executive Briefing