Black Book
Research Insights

2026

HEALTHCARE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONAL DATA ENGINEERING PLATFORMS

A COMPARATIVE RESEARCH PAPER OF SEPARATE PROVIDER AND PAYER MARKET REQUIREMENTS, KPI FRAMEWORKS, AND MODELED BENCHMARK SCORECARDS

Black Book Market Research LLC Insights

01

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Healthcare is entering an operating era in which integration and operational data engineering have shifted from enabling functions to mission-critical production infrastructure. As clinical, financial, and administrative processes span multiple platforms and external partners, performance is increasingly determined by an organization's ability to run interoperability as an industrial capability, reliable under load, observable in real time, governed for safe change, and auditable by design.

Provider organizations require platforms that convert clinical and administrative signals into operational execution. Priority use cases center on procedure readiness and point-of-use supply performance, resilient supply chain operations, workforce and asset uptime, and tight financial controls, delivered through dependable clinical-to-operations data flows and low-friction exception handling at the edge of care delivery.

Payer organizations require platforms that industrialize exchange governance and administrative throughput. Their focus is on API/EDI conformance and partner lifecycle management, prior authorization modernization, workflow orchestration, audit-ready reporting, and security/traceability across high-volume transactions—reducing touches, cycle time, and operational risk while improving control evidence.

This research paper establishes a unified industry category for Healthcare Integration & Operational Data Engineering Platforms, then deliberately separates the analysis into provider and payer segments to reflect materially different needs, operating constraints, and value realization paths. It maps current market demand, trends, regulatory pressures, and implementation challenges for each segment; defines distinct 18-KPI qualitative evaluation frameworks tailored to providers and payers; and presents modeled Top-20 comparative scorecards for each segment to coordinate the broader industry benchmarking study and prepare for survey-validated findings.

02

INTRODUCTION

WHY INTEGRATION + OPERATIONAL DATA ENGINEERING IS NOW "THE PLATFORM"

Healthcare's operational reality is multi-system, multi-party, and policy constrained. No single application tier: EHR, ERP, claims admin, or analytics can deliver end-to-end performance unless the organization can reliably:

- **Move data** between systems and entities (interfaces, APIs, events, EDI),
- **Normalize meaning** (identity, master data, terminology, contracts, authorizations),
- **Orchestrate workflows** across organizational boundaries (tasks, approvals, exceptions),
- **Observe and control** production behavior (monitoring, incident response, release governance),
- **Prove compliance** (audit trails, access controls, traceability).

This is the function of Healthcare Integration & Operational Data Engineering Platforms: the combined layer of interoperability, workflow automation, and operational data discipline that makes enterprise operations performant in real-world healthcare conditions.

WHAT "OPERATIONAL DATA ENGINEERING" MEANS IN HEALTHCARE

In this paper, operational data engineering is not generic analytics. It is the discipline of making operationally critical data:

- **Timely** (near real-time where needed, batch where acceptable),
- **Reliable** (predictable behavior under load and change),
- **Governed** (clear ownership, lineage, access policies),
- **Actionable** (drives workflows, not just dashboards).

In practice, it includes integration engines, iPaaS/API gateways, event streaming, identity/matching, master data controls, and process intelligence, tied to workflow execution.

Providers and payers both need interoperability but they operationalize it differently:

- **Providers:** interoperability exists to drive clinical-to-operations execution (OR readiness, POU adoption, supply resilience, workforce and asset ops, finance control).
- **Payers:** interoperability exists to drive administrative throughput and compliance (API/EDI governance, prior auth modernization, audit-ready reporting, partner onboarding and change governance).

Because the value function diverges, this study uses separate provider and payer vendor sets, separate KPI frameworks, and separate scorecards, while remaining a single industry report.

CATEGORY DEFINITION AND REFERENCE ARCHITECTURE

A Healthcare Integration & Operational Data Engineering Platform is the capability layer that enables:

- **Interoperability at scale** (interfaces, APIs, EDI, partner exchange),
- **Operational data discipline** (identity, master data, process signals),
- **Workflow orchestration** (tasking, exceptions, approvals),
- **Observability and governance** (monitoring, safe change, audit controls).

03

STUDY METHODOLOGY AND PARTICIPATION PROFILE

STUDY DESIGN (CALIBRATION ⟶ MODELED BENCHMARK)

This study uses a two-layer approach:

Layer 1 — Demand calibration

A structured survey and targeted follow-ups were used to confirm the category definition, finalize separate provider and payer needs, validate the evaluation domains, and define the KPI rubrics.

Layer 2 — Modeled comparative benchmark

The scorecards in this paper are an illustrative benchmark designed to coordinate the narrative, establish hypotheses, and structure the upcoming user-validated survey phase.

This role mix intentionally emphasizes run-state accountability (reliability, observability, safe change) because those concerns are central to the category.

PARTICIPATION BREAKDOWN (N = 1,130)

Organization Type Mix (Totals validated)

Organization type	Respondents	% of total (N=1,130)
Health systems / IDNs	313	27.70%
Hospitals	264	23.36%
Ambulatory networks	120	10.62%
Payers / health plans	203	17.96%
Diagnostics	88	7.79%
Clinical service organizations	45	3.98%
Post-acute & home health	68	6.02%
Other clinical entities	29	2.57%
Total	**1,130**	**100.00%**

Role / Function Mix (Totals validated)

The role selection counts sum to 1,140 (10 above respondent N=1,130). Percentages are calculated as % of role selections (N=1,140).

Role / function	Respondents	% of total (role selections N=1,140)
Executive IT leadership	224	19.65%
Integration / interoperability leadership	235	20.61%
Enterprise application owners	153	13.42%
Supply chain leadership	125	10.96%
Clinical informatics / operations	120	10.53%
Payer ops / UM / prior auth + exchange	98	8.60%
Security / compliance / risk	82	7.19%
Data / platform engineering	45	3.95%
Facilities / biomed / asset ops	58	5.09%
Total	**1,140**	**100.00%**

04

INDUSTRY TRENDS AND DEMAND SIGNALS (2026 CROSS-SEGMENT)

Healthcare interoperability has reached a point of maturity where the question is no longer “can systems connect,” but “can integration operate as production infrastructure.” Across providers and payers, integration and operational data engineering are being evaluated with the same seriousness as uptime-critical clinical and financial systems. Buyers are standardizing expectations around reliability, governance, and measurable outcomes because the operational and regulatory consequences of failure are increasing.

01 INTEROPERABILITY IS MOVING FROM “CONNECTIVITY” TO “OPERABILITY”

Most healthcare organizations have already built interfaces, implemented APIs, and stood up exchange connections. What differentiates high performers is whether they can run interoperability as a controlled, observable, continuously improving capability rather than a collection of brittle point connections. In practice, “operability” means integration has an operating model: defined ownership, measurable service levels, predictable release management, and disciplined incident response. The platform layer is expected to provide observability (metrics, logs, traces, synthetic checks), establish incident response discipline (triage procedures, clear escalation paths, measured MTTR), enforce release governance (versioning, regression testing, rollback readiness), and support partner onboarding and lifecycle management so the ecosystem can expand without degrading stability.

02 COMPLIANCE IS NOW AN ENGINEERING CONSTRAINT

Healthcare compliance requirements are increasingly shaping platform architecture in the same way latency and throughput shape engineering design. Audit readiness, traceability, and policy enforcement are moving upstream, from after-the-fact documentation into the operating fabric of integration and workflow execution. As a result, platforms are being judged on whether they can enforce and evidence controls in normal operation: consistent identity and consent handling, policy-aligned access control enforcement across integrations, durable audit trails including immutable or tamper-evident evidence capture where appropriate, and controlled change processes that prove what changed, who approved it, and what impact it had. Compliance is no longer a reporting exercise; it is a runtime requirement.

03 “WORKFLOW-FIRST” INTEGRATION IS RISING

Modern healthcare integration is shifting from “move data” to “move work.” Data transfer alone does not close operational gaps; organizations must also coordinate decisions, exceptions, approvals, and handoffs that span systems and organizational boundaries. This is driving adoption of workflow-centric platform patterns where integration triggers and enriches work execution. Buyers increasingly expect the platform layer to manage exceptions and escalations, orchestrate approvals and policy enforcement, route tasks with accountability through SLA tracking, and support evidence packaging and completeness checks that reduce manual effort and prevent avoidable rework. In both payer and provider environments, this workflow-first posture is a prerequisite for measurable throughput and reliability improvements.

04 OPERATIONAL AI MUST BE GOVERNED, EMBEDDED, AND MEASURABLE

Healthcare buyers are moving away from “AI as an add-on” toward AI as governed operational automation. The acceptance test is no longer model sophistication; it is controlled execution within real workflows. AI capabilities are being evaluated on workflow embeddedness (automation occurs where work happens), governance features that support explainability, permissions, and traceability, and outcomes that show measurable operational impact such as touch reduction, shorter cycle times, fewer exceptions, and improved compliance evidence. In this context, AI is expected to strengthen the operating model: augment decision-making, reduce manual overhead, and improve predictability without weakening auditability or control.

05

PART I – PROVIDER SEGMENT

Provider Market Requirements: Demand and Constraints

Provider organizations are using integration and operational data engineering platforms to turn the clinical enterprise into a predictable operating system, one where clinical signals reliably drive operational execution across perioperative services, supply/POU, workforce, assets, and finance. The priority is not merely connectivity to the EHR ecosystem; it is the ability to sustain procedure readiness and operational control despite constant change, exceptions, and upstream variability.

Provider organizations prioritize platforms to achieve

Providers consistently target operational outcomes that reduce disruption at the point of care while improving cost control and reliability across the enterprise:

- **Procedure readiness** (OR/cath lab/IR) with fewer disruptions and fewer "day-of-case" surprises
- **Point-of-use (POU) adoption** with high clinician compliance and minimal workflow friction
- **Supply resilience**, including management of shortages, substitutions, backorders, and expiration control
- **Operational cost control** through consumption visibility, contract/formulary alignment, and tighter clinical-to-financial linkage
- **Workforce and asset operational uptime**, including facilities/biomed work execution and service request reliability

In operational terms, providers are buying the capability to reliably convert schedules and case events into materials, tasks, and controls—at the right time, in the right place, with a controlled exception pathway.

Provider-specific challenges

Provider environments are uniquely difficult because the operational workload is both high-stakes and high-variance. Even well-integrated environments fail when they cannot handle exceptions at production speed.

Key constraints include:

- **Multi-vendor EHR ecosystems and downstream applications** that produce fragmented signals and inconsistent event timing
- **Brittle item master and identity fragmentation**, which drives downstream matching errors, substitutions, and reconciliation burdens
- **Clinical exceptions that change minute-to-minute**, requiring rapid updates without destabilizing workflows
- **Operational dependency chains** where small upstream changes cascade (schedule → case cart → inventory → staff → billing)
- **Adoption friction at the point-of-use**, where extra clicks, delays, or missing items quickly cause workarounds and data loss

The practical implication: provider platforms must be evaluated on their ability to perform under real operating pressure, not only on feature checklists.

Top-performing provider platforms behave like production infrastructure—stable, observable, governable, and outcome-oriented. They demonstrate:

- **Reliable integration run-state with disciplined observability** (clear ownership, actionable alerting, fast diagnosis and resolution)
- **Safe change velocity** (versioning and CI/CD patterns, regression prevention, rollback readiness)
- **Workflow-embedded master data governance**, where stewardship is operationalized through controls and exception workflows, not left as periodic cleanup
- **Exception-driven process design** for substitutions, backorders, schedule changes, preference card variance, and late case updates
- **Measurable procedure readiness outcomes**, including fewer disruptions, fewer missing-item events, higher POU compliance, and reduced rework

In short, provider buyers are demanding platforms that do not just integrate systems, they stabilize operations, reduce variability, and produce evidence of readiness and control in environments where failure is operationally expensive and clinically disruptive.

PROVIDER KPI FRAMEWORK (18 QUALITATIVE KPIS)

Provider segment scoring weights (composite index)

25% Interoperability & Integration	**25%** Clinical-to-Operations Data Flows
25% Supply Chain & Point-of-Use	**10%** AI & Automation (governed)
10% Implementation & Value Realization	**5%** Compliance / Security / Data Governance

PROVIDER QUALITATIVE KPI FRAMEWORK (18 KPIS)

A INTEROPERABILITY & INTEGRATION (6 KPIS)

1 Integration Reliability Confidence (Stable Run-State)

Measures whether integrations operate predictably in production with minimal manual intervention and low unplanned downtime. Intended result is fewer integration-caused disruptions to clinical and operational workflows, with stable performance under routine variability and peak demand.

2 Monitoring & Observability Maturity (Alerting, Diagnostics, Ownership, MTTR Discipline)

Assesses the platform's ability to detect, diagnose, and resolve integration issues using actionable telemetry (metrics/logs/traces) and clear operational ownership. Intended result is faster mean-time-to-repair (MTTR), fewer escalations, and reduced "silent failures" that create downstream operational surprises.

3 Safe Change Velocity (Versioning, Regression Controls, Rollback Readiness)

Evaluates how quickly integration and workflow logic can be changed without causing regressions, outages, or partner breakage. Intended result is predictable release cadence with controlled risk, enabling rapid adaptation to new workflows, standards updates, and operational priorities.

4 Standards Handling Competence (Healthcare Messaging and API Patterns)

Measures competence in implementing healthcare interoperability standards and patterns across interfaces and APIs, including validation, mapping, and testing discipline. Intended result is reduced translation defects and higher confidence that exchanged data retains correct meaning across systems and partners.

5 Integration Governance Clarity (Ownership, Approvals, Environments, Release Management)

Assesses whether governance is explicit and enforceable: who owns integrations, how approvals work, how environments are controlled, and how releases are managed. Intended result is fewer unowned interfaces, fewer uncontrolled changes, and greater accountability for performance and compliance.

6 Secure Integration Practices (Least Privilege, Audit Trails, PHI-Aware Controls)

Evaluates how well integrations enforce security controls, including access governance, credential management, encryption, and audit trails appropriate for PHI-sensitive workflows. Intended result is lower risk exposure, stronger compliance posture, and demonstrable traceability for who accessed what data and when.

B CLINICAL-TO-OPERATIONS DATA FLOWS (4 KPIS)

7 EHR-to-Ops Signal Fidelity (Case Events, Schedules, Charge/Resource Triggers)

Measures the accuracy, timeliness, and completeness of key clinical operational signals flowing from EHR and ancillary systems into enterprise operations workflows. Intended result is better synchronization between clinical events and operational execution, reducing late changes, surprises, and rework.

8 Master Data Discipline (Items, Locations, Providers, Cost Centers; Governance and Reconciliation)

Assesses the platform's ability to maintain consistent master data and to reconcile discrepancies across EHR, ERP, supply, and departmental systems. Intended result is fewer mismatches that drive exceptions, cleaner financial alignment, and higher trust in downstream automation and reporting.

9 Exception Handling Usability (Substitutions, Backorders, Late Changes; Workflow Speed/Clarity)

Evaluates how efficiently users can manage inevitable exceptions, including substitutions, missing items, backorders, and schedule-driven changes. Intended result is faster resolution with fewer workarounds, preserving data integrity while keeping care delivery moving.

10 Cross-Functional Alignment Enablement (Clinical, Periop, Supply, Finance; Fewer Shadow Processes)

Measures the platform's ability to coordinate shared workflows and definitions across departments, reducing swivel-chair activity and parallel shadow systems. Intended result is smoother handoffs, consistent controls, and fewer disputes over "what happened" and "who owns the fix."

C SUPPLY CHAIN & POINT-OF-USE (3 KPIS)

11 Point-of-Use Adoption Friction (Edge Usability; Compliance Without Policing)

Assesses usability and workflow fit at the point of care, including how easily clinicians and staff capture consumption and handle exceptions without added burden. Intended result is higher adoption and more accurate consumption data, reducing leakage and improving replenishment accuracy.

12 Procedure Readiness Confidence (Right Item, Right Place, Right Time; Fewer Disruptions)

Measures how reliably the platform supports procedure readiness by ensuring required materials, kits, and substitutions are available when needed. Intended result is fewer case delays and disruptions, lower overtime and rush costs, and improved clinician confidence in operational preparedness.

13 Contract/Formulary Compliance Enablement (Guided Workflows, Measurable Adherence)

Evaluates how well the platform guides users toward compliant purchasing and usage decisions through embedded controls and visibility. Intended result is higher adherence with fewer manual audits, improved savings capture, and reduced variation that undermines standardization efforts.

D AI & AUTOMATION (3 KPIS)

14 Workflow-Embedded Automation (Approvals, Replenishment, Exceptions, Tasking)

Assesses usability and workflow fit at the point of care, including how easily clinicians and staff capture consumption and handle exceptions without added burden. Intended result is higher adoption and more accurate consumption data, reducing leakage and improving replenishment accuracy.

15 Trust, Auditability, and Permissions (Reviewable Outputs; Role-Based Governance)

Assesses whether automated recommendations and actions are explainable, reviewable, and governed with role-based permissions and traceable evidence. Intended result is operational automation that can be adopted at scale without weakening controls, accountability, or compliance.

16 Operational Impact Credibility (Cycle-Time Reduction, Fewer Exceptions, Less Rework)

Evaluates whether the platform can demonstrate measurable operational outcomes attributable to automation and improved data flows. Intended result is defensible ROI evidenced by fewer exceptions, shorter resolution times, reduced rework, and improved readiness or throughput.

E IMPLEMENTATION & VALUE REALIZATION (2 KPIS)

17 Implementation Predictability (Scope Control, Integration Readiness Assessed Early)

Measures the consistency of delivery outcomes: realistic scoping, dependency management, integration readiness validation, and timeline reliability. Intended result is fewer surprises, faster stabilization, and reduced "implementation drag" that delays operational value.

18 Post-Go-Live Optimization Discipline (Continuous Improvement Cadence, KPI Ownership)

Assesses whether the vendor and client operating model supports ongoing optimization with clear KPI ownership, release cadence, and adoption governance. Intended result is sustained performance improvement after go-live, preventing regression and ensuring the platform continues to mature with operational needs.

PROVIDER MODELED BENCHMARK SCORECARD (TOP 20)

The provider model rewards integration operability as a multiplier across clinical-to-ops and supply readiness (KPIs 1–3, then 7–13). For this modeled scorecard, the composite is shown as the unweighted mean of the six domain scores (final column).

Provider Rank	Vendor	Interop	Clin→Ops	Supply/ POU	AI	Implementation	Compliance	Composite (mean)
1	Infor	9.89	9.93	9.89	9.77	9.46	9.58	9.75
2	Oracle	9.32	9.30	9.27	9.01	9.07	8.58	9.09
3	Redox	9.69	9.05	8.71	8.44	8.99	8.84	8.95
4	NextGen (Mirth)	9.53	9.07	8.24	8.38	8.79	8.54	8.76
5	Rhapsody	9.39	8.74	8.30	7.95	8.53	8.64	8.59
6	SAP	8.45	8.43	8.69	8.48	8.93	8.31	8.55
7	Epic	8.30	8.58	8.12	8.32	8.18	8.67	8.36
8	Microsoft (Azure + Dynamics 365)	8.82	8.30	7.85	7.22	8.79	8.98	8.33
9	ServiceNow	8.96	8.41	7.92	7.35	8.46	8.33	8.24
10	MuleSoft	8.89	7.21	7.08	7.48	7.63	8.04	7.72
11	GHX	7.61	7.24	8.04	7.20	7.57	7.66	7.55
12	Tecsys	7.03	7.56	8.33	7.09	7.84	7.38	7.54
13	InterSystems	7.08	7.49	6.75	7.20	7.22	7.81	7.26
14	Boomi	8.52	6.29	6.17	7.37	7.26	7.73	7.22
15	Athenahealth	7.06	7.18	6.46	7.02	8.05	7.21	7.16
16	Workday	6.56	5.69	5.80	6.85	8.52	7.08	6.75
17	IBM Maximo	6.66	6.08	6.33	7.40	6.09	7.86	6.74
18	Nuvolo	6.43	6.05	6.53	6.28	6.32	7.03	6.44
19	UKG	5.27	5.49	5.68	5.65	8.17	7.82	6.35
20	MEDITECH	3.85	5.99	5.32	5.08	6.24	4.55	5.17

- The top tier reflects platforms that combine: (a) strong integration discipline and (b) enterprise operations execution depth.
- The mid-tier reflects strength in a subset (e.g., supply specialization, workflow orchestration, or interoperability) but less breadth across clinical-to-ops and enterprise execution.

06

PART II – PAYER SEGMENT

PAYER MARKET: DEMAND, CHALLENGES, AND TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

Payer Market: Demand, Challenges, and Technical Requirements

Payers prioritize integration and operational data engineering to achieve:

- **Exchange governance at scale** (partner onboarding, conformance testing, versioning),
- **Administrative throughput** (touch reduction, cycle time improvements),
- **Prior authorization modernization** (workflow orchestration, status transparency, evidence handling),
- **Audit-ready reporting** (regulatory and operational metrics),
- **Security and traceability** across transactions and workflows.

Payer-specific challenges

Payers face:

- high partner variance (providers, TPAs, PBMs, clearinghouses),
- complex policy enforcement (consent/opt-out, access rules),
- frequent change cycles (implementation guides, contracts, reporting),
- large transaction volumes and latency sensitivity,
- operational risk tied to evidence and auditability.

Payer technical demands

Top-performing payer platforms exhibit:

- strict exchange conformance and predictable performance under load,
- end-to-end monitoring with partner-facing transparency,
- safe change velocity with versioning and regression controls,
- workflow-first evidence handling (completeness checks, routing, audit trails),
- strong control evidence and traceability.

PAYER KPI FRAMEWORK (18 QUALITATIVE KPIS)

Payer segment scoring weights (composite index)

35% Interoperability / API & EDI Governance	**10%** Core Administration Platform Capability
15% Workflow Automation & UM/Prior Auth Modernization	**10%** Data Governance & Reporting Readiness
10% Implementation & Time-to-Compliance	**20%** Compliance / Security / Auditability

PAYER QUALITATIVE KPI FRAMEWORK (18 KPIS)

A INTEROPERABILITY / API & EDI GOVERNANCE (6 KPIS)

1 Conformance Readiness (Standards Alignment, Testability, Partner Onboarding Discipline)

Measures the payer's ability to implement standards consistently with clear testing, validation, and partner onboarding procedures. Intended result is fewer failed transactions and faster partner connectivity with predictable, repeatable conformance outcomes.

2 Exchange Reliability and Throughput (Availability Under Load; Predictable Performance)

Assesses whether exchange services perform consistently at production scale, including peak-volume conditions and multi-partner variability. Intended result is stable processing with fewer backlogs, fewer partner disputes, and reduced operational firefighting caused by performance variability.

3 **Monitoring & Observability Maturity (SLAs, Incident Response, Partner-Facing Transparency)**

Evaluates whether exchange operations are measurable and manageable through actionable telemetry, defined SLAs, and disciplined incident response. Intended result is faster detection and resolution, reduced downtime impact, and improved partner confidence through transparent operational communication.

4 **Safe Change Velocity (Versioning, Regression Controls, Partner Coordination, Release Governance)**

Measures the payer's ability to release changes—standards updates, partner requirements, workflow modifications—without breaking existing integrations. Intended result is a predictable release cadence with controlled risk, reducing regression-driven outages and minimizing partner disruption.

5 **Identity, Consent, and Policy Enforcement (Controls Applied Consistently Across Exchange)**

Assesses the consistency of identity handling and policy enforcement across transactions, partners, and channels, including consent and access constraints where applicable. Intended result is reduced compliance risk, fewer identity-driven exceptions, and greater trust that exchange behavior matches policy intent.

6 **End-to-End Security and Traceability (Audit Trails Across Transactions and Workflows)**

Evaluates whether transactions and associated workflow actions can be traced end-to-end with reliable audit evidence and security controls. Intended result is demonstrable control evidence, faster investigations, and reduced exposure from incomplete or fragmented audit trails.

B CORE ADMINISTRATION PLATFORM CAPABILITY (4 KPIS)

7 **Claims/Enrollment/Benefits Configuration Flexibility (Time-to-Change Without Instability)**

Measures how quickly payer teams can implement changes in claims, enrollment, and benefits logic without destabilizing production operations. Intended result is faster policy and product change execution with fewer defects, rework cycles, and post-release incidents.

8 **Provider Network and Contract Operations Enablement (Operational Usability and Control Evidence)**

Assesses the platform's support for network operations—contracts, provider data, configuration governance—and the ability to produce evidence of controls. Intended result is reduced administrative burden, fewer disputes, and stronger audit readiness around network-related decisions.

9 **Administrative Workflow Coherence (Reduced Swivel-Chair Between Core + Portals + Workflow Tools)**

Evaluates the degree to which administrative work can be executed in coherent workflows rather than fragmented across portals, core systems, spreadsheets, and email. Intended result is improved staff productivity, fewer handoff failures, and more consistent application of policies and SLAs.

10 **Payment Operations Readiness (Controls, Reconciliation Support, Exception Handling Discipline)**

Measures operational control over payment processes, including reconciliation, exception resolution, and audit evidence. Intended result is fewer payment errors, faster resolution of payment exceptions, and improved financial controls with clear accountability.

C WORKFLOW AUTOMATION & UM/PRIOR AUTHORIZATION MODERNIZATION (3 KPIS)

11 **UM/Prior Auth Workflow Orchestration (Tasking, Routing, Status Transparency, Escalation Paths)**

Assesses the payer's ability to manage utilization management and authorization work as orchestrated processes with clear tasking, routing rules, and status visibility. Intended result is reduced cycle time, fewer escalations, and higher predictability for both internal teams and external partners.

12 **Documentation and Evidence Handling Efficiency (Packaging, Routing, Completeness Checks)**

Measures how effectively the platform can collect, validate, route, and store documentation and evidence required for decisions and audits. Intended result is fewer incomplete submissions, fewer rework loops, and improved decision timeliness with stronger audit readiness.

13 **Operational Impact Credibility (Touch Reduction, Cycle Time Improvement, Fewer Escalations)**

Evaluates whether automation and modernization initiatives produce measurable operational gains attributable to platform capabilities. Intended result is defensible ROI demonstrated through reduced touches per case, shorter cycle times, fewer disputes, and lower administrative cost per transaction.

17 **Privacy and Access Governance (Role-Based Access, Least Privilege, Partner Segmentation)**

Assesses access governance across internal users and external partners, including segmentation, least privilege, and consistent enforcement. Intended result is reduced data exposure risk and clearer accountability for access decisions, especially in multi-partner exchange environments.

D DATA GOVERNANCE & REPORTING READINESS (2 KPIS)

14 **Reporting Readiness (Audit-Ready Metrics; Consistent Definitions Across Systems)**

Measures the payer's ability to produce standardized, reconcilable metrics across operational systems without manual stitching or definition conflicts. Intended result is reliable reporting for compliance, executive oversight, and partner transparency with fewer reconciliation cycles.

15 **Data Governance Discipline (Lineage, Stewardship, Issue Resolution Cadence)**

Assesses whether governance processes exist to maintain data quality and traceability, including lineage, ownership, and a consistent defect resolution cadence. Intended result is reduced "report distrust," fewer disputes over data meaning, and lower operational friction driven by data inconsistency.

E COMPLIANCE / SECURITY / AUDITABILITY (2 KPIS)

16 **Policy-to-Control Mapping (Demonstrable Controls, Evidence Capture, Repeatability)**

Measures how well policy requirements are translated into operational controls that can be demonstrated repeatedly and evidenced without extraordinary effort. Intended result is lower compliance risk, faster audits, and fewer gaps between documented policy and actual operating behavior.

F IMPLEMENTATION & TIME-TO-COMPLIANCE (1 KPI)

18 **Implementation Predictability and Dependency Management (Partners, Timelines, Regression Risk)**

Measures the payer's ability to deliver platform change predictably despite external dependencies such as trading partners, standards updates, and policy deadlines. Intended result is faster time-to-compliance with fewer schedule slips, fewer regressions, and reduced operational disruption during rollout.

PAYER MODELED BENCHMARK SCORECARD (TOP 20)

Provider-centric platforms are excluded from this payer vendor set.

Payer interpretation: what the scorecard implies

- The payer model rewards exchange governance + compliance evidence (operability, traceability, auditability) and workflow modernization (UM/prior auth orchestration).
- Platforms that combine strong interoperability discipline with administrative workflow execution rise to the top, while provider-centric clinical platforms are excluded by design because they do not represent payer core operating requirements.

For this modeled scorecard, the composite is shown as the unweighted mean of the six domain scores (final column).

Provider Rank	Vendor	Interop/API&EDI	Core Admin	Workflow /UM	Data/ Reporting	Implementation	Compliance	Composite (mean)
1	Infor	9.75	9.44	9.59	9.4	9.77	9.36	9.55
2	Oracle	9.9	9.9	8.85	9.12	8.78	9.22	9.29
3	Optum (incl. Change Healthcare assets)	9.07	9.26	8.94	8.79	8.35	8.95	8.89
4	Availity	9.47	8.26	9.03	8.51	8.47	8.8	8.76
5	HealthEdge	8.93	8.81	8.39	8.82	8.58	8.88	8.74
6	Microsoft (Azure + Dynamics 365)	8.76	7.48	8.65	8.77	8.35	8.72	8.46
7	Edifecs	9.06	8.04	8.44	8.29	8.18	8.47	8.41
8	Salesforce (Health Cloud)	8.73	7.65	8.66	8.31	8.17	8.48	8.33
9	SAP	8.26	8.92	8.07	8.17	7.92	8.32	8.28
10	Pegasystems	8.04	7.77	9.16	8.09	8.23	8.35	8.27
11	ServiceNow	8.45	7.42	8.76	8	8.57	8.33	8.25
12	MuleSoft	9.17	7.04	8.28	7.88	8.76	8.02	8.19
13	Cognizant TriZetto	7.86	8.43	7.86	8.24	7.56	8.22	8.03
14	SS&C Health	8.02	8.42	7.69	8.4	7.24	8.12	7.98
15	Informatica	8.25	6.95	7.43	9.06	7.67	8.42	7.96
16	Confluent	8.5	6.64	7.71	8.75	7.54	8.55	7.95
17	Boomi	8.99	7	8.02	7.55	7.78	8.28	7.94
18	InterSystems	8.56	7.02	7.69	8.23	7.45	8.34	7.88
19	Cotiviti	7.11	8.1	7.6	7.82	7.32	8.17	7.69
20	Zelis	7.24	7.32	7.05	7.52	6.54	6.93	7.1

07

PART III: KEY FINDINGS (CROSS-SEGMENT SYNTHESIS)

INTEGRATION OPERABILITY IS THE SHARED "GATEKEEPER CAPABILITY"

Both segments converge on the same gating requirements:

- reliable production behavior,
- observability,
- safe change velocity,
- governance and audit trails.

Without these, downstream capabilities (clinical-to-ops for providers; UM throughput for payers) degrade.

PROVIDERS MONETIZE INTEGRATION THROUGH OPERATIONAL READINESS

Provider value is realized when integration translates into:

- fewer procedure disruptions,
- higher POU adoption,
- better item master discipline,
- measurable operational cost control.

PAYERS MONETIZE INTEGRATION THROUGH ADMINISTRATIVE THROUGHPUT AND EVIDENCE

Payer value is realized when integration translates into:

- reduced touches and cycle time,
- predictable partner exchange operations,
- audit-ready reporting,
- controlled change and conformance management.

08

CONCLUSION

CROSS-SEGMENT SCORECARD RESULTS

Across both segment scorecards—Providers and Payers—the results converge on a single overarching finding: platform leadership in healthcare integration and operational data engineering is increasingly determined by operability at scale (reliability, observability, safe change, governance, and auditability) combined with the ability to translate data into executable workflows.

Cross-segment leaders

- Infor ranks #1 in both Provider and Payer platforms, with consistently high performance across all evaluated domains and no weak-area drag. On the composite scores shown here (unweighted mean of six domain scores), Infor leads by 0.66 points in Providers (9.75 vs 9.09) and 0.26 points in Payers (9.55 vs 9.29) versus the #2 vendor—indicating clear separation at the top tier rather than a statistical tie.
- **Oracle ranks #2 in both segments**, reflecting strong enterprise-grade interoperability and administrative/operations foundations. Oracle's profile is distinguished by breadth and infrastructure-grade capability, with comparatively more variance in certain domains depending on segment requirements.

PROVIDER SCORECARD IMPLICATIONS

In the provider segment, the top-tier pattern is defined by the ability to convert EHR and perioperative signals into operational execution (POU, supply readiness, finance alignment) while maintaining production-grade integration operations.

- **Infor's #1 standing** is structurally reinforced by strength across the clinical-to-operations and supply/POU execution stack while also meeting the non-negotiables of run-state reliability and governance.
- **Oracle's #2 standing** reflects strong enterprise operations foundations and integration competence, performing best where providers require broad operational platform coverage and controlled integration at scale.

Notable single-area standouts in the provider segment (beyond the top two)

These are "peak" performances that typically map to one KPI group and are often decisive in platform shortlists:

01 **Redox — Interoperability peak (Interop 9.69)**

standout for accelerated connectivity and integration enablement, aligning to KPIs focused on standards handling, speed-to-connect, and operationalized exchange patterns.

02 **NextGen (Mirth) — Interoperability operations peak (Interop 9.53)**

strong interface lifecycle execution and standards-centric integration operations, aligning to KPIs on standards handling and safe change within interface ecosystems.

03 **Microsoft (Azure + Dynamics 365) — Compliance/control posture peak (Compliance 8.98)**

notable for governance and security posture in modern cloud operating models, aligning to secure integration and evidence-ready controls.

04 **SAP — Execution strength in operational domains (Supply/POU 8.69; Implementation 8.93)**

strong operational platform delivery characteristics where procurement/supply standardization and implementation discipline are decisive.

05 **Tecsys — Supply/POU specialization peak (Supply/POU 8.33)**

notable depth in provider supply execution and distribution workflows, aligning to point-of-use adoption and readiness KPIs.

06 **Workday — Implementation predictability peak (Implementation 8.52)**

differentiates where workforce/finance modernization success depends on delivery stability and adoption governance.

07 **IBM Maximo — Asset operations peak (AI 7.40; Compliance 7.86)**

notable for facilities/biomed and asset lifecycle operational control in provider estates, aligning to uptime and operational governance needs.

PAYER SCORECARD IMPLICATIONS

In the payer segment, the top-tier pattern is defined by exchange governance + auditability and the ability to modernize administrative throughput (especially UM/prior auth) using workflow-first orchestration with traceability and partner lifecycle control.

- **Infor's #1 standing** reflects broad strength across exchange operability, workflow enablement, and compliance-grade control evidence—positioned as an integrated platform posture for payer operations modernization.
- **Oracle's #2 standing** is reinforced by exceptional interoperability and core administrative strength, performing best where payers prioritize enterprise-grade foundations and scalability.

Notable single-area standouts in the payer segment (beyond the top two)

These are "peak" performances that typically map to one KPI group and are often decisive in platform shortlists:

01 **Oracle — dual peak leadership (Interop/API&EDI 9.90; Core Admin 9.90)**

strongest single-domain results in the payer table, aligning directly to conformance readiness, exchange stability, and core configuration flexibility.

02 **Availity — exchange and admin throughput peak (Interop/API&EDI 9.47; Workflow/UM 9.03)**

standout where network-scale connectivity and administrative exchange efficiency drive outcomes.

03 **Optum (incl. Change Healthcare assets) — core operations peak (Core Admin 9.26)**

strong administrative and exchange infrastructure profile with credible throughput characteristics.

04 **Pegasystems — workflow orchestration peak (Workflow/UM 9.16)**

standout for UM/prior auth modernization mechanics (routing, case management, escalation control), aligning to workflow-first KPI priorities.

05 **Informatica — reporting/data governance peak (Data/Reporting 9.06)**

standout for audit-ready reporting consistency, lineage, and data governance discipline in complex payer ecosystems.

06 **Confluent — real-time operational data engineering peak (Data/Reporting 8.75; Compliance 8.55)**

notable for event-driven throughput patterns that support operability and controlled data movement at scale.

07 **HealthEdge — balanced payer core profile (Core Admin 8.81; Data/Reporting 8.82)**

strong where payer transformation is anchored in core administration modernization with governed reporting.

WHAT THIS MEANS FOR THE INDUSTRY STUDY

- The scorecards support an industry direction: integration excellence alone is no longer sufficient—leaders combine integration operability with enterprise operational execution and workflow governance.
- "Best fit" will remain segment- and operating-model dependent. Even where overall rank differs, several vendors demonstrate domain-leading peaks that can outperform higher-ranked vendors in narrowly defined use cases (e.g., UM/prior auth orchestration, EDI/API conformance operations, supply/POU execution, or audit-ready reporting governance).
- The next validation step for the broader survey is to tie these domain peaks to KPI-level user evidence—especially around operability (observability, MTTR, safe change), workflow execution (exception handling and SLA control), and audit-ready traceability across exchange and operational processes.

09

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A
DEFINING THE 2026 HEALTHCARE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONAL DATA ENGINEERING PLATFORMS CATEGORIES

A1 CATEGORY BOUNDARY

Healthcare Integration & Operational Data Engineering Platforms comprise the capabilities that make multi-system healthcare operations run reliably at scale: interoperability, workflow orchestration, operational data governance, and production-grade observability. The category deliberately focuses on **run-state operability** (reliability, monitoring, safe change), not on one-time interface buildouts or purely analytical reporting.

A2 PROVIDER VS PAYER PLATFORM EMPHASIS

Providers prioritize platforms that convert clinical and administrative signals into **operational execution** (perioperative readiness, point-of-use adoption, supply resilience, workforce/asset uptime, and financial controls). Provider platform programs tend to be anchored in enterprise operations suites, supply/POU systems, clinical-to-ops integration, and integration engines/iPaaS/API layers.

Payers prioritize platforms that industrialize **exchange governance and administrative throughput** (API/EDI conformance, partner onboarding, UM/prior auth modernization, evidence packaging, audit-ready reporting, and compliance controls). Payer platform programs tend to be anchored in core administration platforms, interoperability/EDI/API platforms, workflow/BPM and orchestration, and data governance/traceability tooling.

A3 OPERATING MODEL IMPLICATIONS (BOTH SEGMENTS)

Successful platforms are less about "feature presence" and more about the operating model they enable:

- **Integration-as-a-product:** owned services, standard patterns, predictable releases.
- **Observability-by-design:** measurable SLOs, actionable alerting, rapid incident resolution.
- **Safe change velocity:** regression controls, versioning, partner coordination, rollback readiness.
- **Audit-ready engineering:** immutable logs where appropriate, policy enforcement, evidence capture.

A4 WHERE PLATFORM VALUE IS REALIZED (DIFFERENCE IN MEASURABLE OUTCOMES)

- **Provider outcome vectors:** fewer procedure disruptions, increased POU adoption, improved item/master data integrity, fewer exceptions, reduced supply leakage, measurable productivity gains in periop and supply operations.
- **Payer outcome vectors:** touch reduction, cycle-time improvements in UM/prior auth, fewer escalations and disputes, partner onboarding speed, conformance stability, audit-ready reporting consistency.

APPENDIX B
KPI CROSSWALK, SCORING RUBRICS, AND SURVEY IMPLEMENTATION BLUEPRINT

B1 PROVIDER KPI-TO-DOMAIN CROSSWALK

25%
Interoperability & Integration
KPIs 1–6

25%
Clinical-to-Operations Data Flows
KPIs 7–10

25%
Supply Chain & Point-of-Use
KPIs 11–13

10%
AI & Automation
KPIs 14–16

10%
Implementation & Value Realization
KPIs 17–18

5%
Compliance/Security/ Data Governance
KPI 6 is the core driver, supported by evidence captured across the program

B2 PAYER KPI-TO-DOMAIN CROSSWALK

35%
Interoperability / API & EDI Governance
KPIs 1–6

10%
Core Administration Platform Capability
KPIs 7–10

15%
Workflow Automation & UM/Prior Auth
KPIs 11–13

10%
Data Governance & Reporting
KPIs 14–16

10%
Implementation & Time-to-Compliance
KPIs 18

20%
Compliance / Security / Auditability
KPIs 16–17 (supported by KPI 6)

B3 FIVE-LEVEL ANCHORED RUBRIC (RECOMMENDED)

Use a consistent five-level rubric for each KPI to ensure comparability and to reduce "definition drift" across respondents.

Level 1 — Ad hoc / fragile

manual oversight required; frequent breakage; unclear ownership; inconsistent controls.

Level 2 — Basic / reactive

works for limited scope; monitoring is partial; fixes are mostly reactive; change is risky.

Level 3 — Defined / repeatable

standard patterns exist; monitoring and ownership are established; changes are controlled.

Level 4 — Managed / measured

clear SLOs/SLAs; proactive detection; strong governance; predictable change velocity; metrics drive improvement.

Level 5 — Optimized / industrialized

automation of detection and remediation where appropriate; advanced observability; mature lifecycle governance; continuous improvement embedded.

B4 SURVEY ITEM CONSTRUCTION (PRACTICAL GUIDANCE)

- Each KPI should be scored with (a) a numeric rating and (b) a short forced-choice justification (e.g., "primary reason for score").
- Capture a "scope qualifier" per KPI (enterprise-wide, line-of-business, single site, pilot) to normalize ratings.
- Require respondents to indicate deployment model (on-prem, cloud, hybrid), integration operating model (central CoE vs distributed), and maturity stage; these become essential segmentation controls.

B5 SCORECARD PUBLICATION STANDARDS

- Publish **provider and payer scorecards separately** with separate vendor sets.
- For each segment, publish both (a) the overall composite rank and (b) domain leaders, since buyers often optimize for specific domains.

APPENDIX C
VENDOR DIRECTORY (REFERENCE MANUAL)

Integration & Platform Vendors Serving Healthcare (Providers, Payers, or Both Payers and Providers) Each vendor received at least one validated client ballot 2026.

Alphabetical; concise entries; capabilities oriented to integration, operational platforms, workflow, and operational data engineering.

Accenture — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** systems integration, platform modernization, interoperability programs, cloud migration, and operating-model design.
- **Typical clients:** large health systems, national payers, and multinational healthcare services organizations.
- **Innovations:** reusable accelerators for API-led integration and run-state observability patterns.
- **Geographic client footprint:** North America, EMEA, APAC with global delivery. Frequently engaged for complex multi-vendor integration and enterprise transformation programs.

Accruent — Providers

- **Capabilities:** facilities, asset operations, and maintenance platforms that integrate with enterprise operations and service workflows.
- **Typical clients:** hospitals, ambulatory networks, and health estates teams.
- **Innovations:** mobile work execution and asset lifecycle analytics integrated into operational workflows.
- **Geographic client footprint:** strongest in North America with international footprint. Often positioned alongside ITSM and EAM platforms in provider operations modernization.

Altera Digital Health — Providers

- **Capabilities:** clinical and operational platform components with integration requirements into enterprise systems and external networks.
- **Typical clients:** hospitals and health systems modernizing clinical-to-ops workflows.
- **Innovations:** interoperability enhancements and operational workflow integration patterns.
- **Geographic client footprint:** North America with growing international presence. Typically evaluated where providers need legacy clinical platform integration and modernization pathways.

Amazon Web Services (AWS) — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** cloud infrastructure, managed integration services, API gateway patterns, data platforms, and security tooling.
- **Typical clients:** payers and providers building modern integration and data engineering stacks.
- **Innovations:** event-driven architectures, managed streaming, and scalable observability services used for run-state integration operations.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Frequently used as a foundation layer for integration, automation, and operational data platforms.

Apigee (Google Cloud) — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** API management, security, throttling, developer portals, and analytics for exchange governance.
- **Typical clients:** payers and providers operating large partner ecosystems and API programs.
- **Innovations:** policy-driven API controls and lifecycle governance.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global with strong enterprise adoption. Often used as an API governance layer alongside integration engines and iPaaS.

Atos (Eviden) — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** digital transformation services, integration delivery, cloud programs, and managed operations.
- **Typical clients:** large health systems, government-linked healthcare organizations, and insurers in select markets.
- **Innovations:** standardized integration delivery and managed service models.
- **Geographic client footprint:** strong in Europe with global delivery. Often engaged for complex integration and operations outsourcing.

Avality — Payers

- **Capabilities:** payer-provider connectivity, administrative transactions, portal services, and network exchange.
- **Typical clients:** health plans and provider organizations interacting with them (primarily payer-sponsored connectivity programs).
- **Innovations:** network-scale workflow enablement and transaction routing.
- **Geographic client footprint:** predominantly U.S. Often used to reduce administrative friction and support standardized exchange operations.

Boomi — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** iPaaS integration, API management functions, and prebuilt connectors for enterprise applications.
- **Typical clients:** providers and payers modernizing integration and data movement.
- **Innovations:** rapid integration deployment with governance features.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Often adopted for integration acceleration across mixed application portfolios.

Atos (Eviden) — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** digital transformation services, integration delivery, cloud programs, and managed operations.
- **Typical clients:** large health systems, government-linked healthcare organizations, and insurers in select markets.
- **Innovations:** standardized integration delivery and managed service models.
- **Geographic client footprint:** strong in Europe with global delivery. Often engaged for complex integration and operations outsourcing.

Capgemini — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** integration delivery, cloud and data engineering services, managed operations, and platform modernization.
- **Typical clients:** large payers and provider systems with complex transformation programs.
- **Innovations:** industry delivery frameworks and automation-based operations models.
- **Geographic client footprint:** Europe and North America with global delivery. Commonly used for multi-year modernization and platform consolidation.

Axway — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** API management, B2B integration, secure file transfer, and governance tooling.
- **Typical clients:** enterprises with high-volume partner exchange requirements including healthcare.
- **Innovations:** controlled partner onboarding and secure exchange patterns.
- **Geographic client footprint:** North America and Europe with global deployments. Commonly evaluated for secure exchange modernization in regulated environments.

Change Healthcare (Optum) — Payers

- **Capabilities:** clearinghouse-scale connectivity, transaction processing, and administrative exchange tooling.
- **Typical clients:** health plans and taransaction network participants.
- **Innovations:** workflow enablement around high-volume administrative exchange.
- **Geographic client footprint:** primarily U.S. Often evaluated where scale, throughput, and partner connectivity are central requirements.

BMC Software — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** IT service management and operations automation that can coordinate platform operations.
- **Typical clients:** large enterprises, including health systems and payers.
- **Innovations:** automated incident workflows and service assurance frameworks.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Often considered as an ITSM alternative in healthcare operational governance programs.

Cognizant — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** payer platform services, provider integration services, managed operations, and modernization delivery.
- **Typical clients:** health plans and large provider organizations.
- **Innovations:** standardized delivery, automation, and operational governance models for platform programs.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global with strong North America presence. Frequently engaged for platform modernization and integration operations.

Cognizant TriZetto — Payers

- **Capabilities:** payer core administration platforms and related integration ecosystems.
- **Typical clients:** health plans and managed care organizations.
- **Innovations:** configurable payer operations stacks and modernization pathways.
- **Geographic client footprint:** primarily North America with broader footprint through global delivery. Commonly part of payer platform evaluations involving core admin, UM operations, and exchange modernization.

Confluent — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** enterprise event streaming used for real-time integration and operational data pipelines.
- **Typical clients:** payers and providers building event-driven architectures.
- **Innovations:** scalable streaming with governance and operational controls.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Often deployed as a backbone for near real-time interoperability and operational signal propagation.

Cotiviti — Payers

- **Capabilities:** payment integrity, analytics-driven operations, and workflow enablement for cost containment programs.
- **Typical clients:** health plans and payer service organizations.
- **Innovations:** operational analytics integrated into payer workflows and governance.
- **Geographic client footprint:** primarily North America with additional markets. Often integrated with core admin and reporting ecosystems.

Coupa — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** procurement and spend management platforms that integrate with ERP and supply workflows.
- **Typical clients:** provider systems and payer enterprises with broad procurement needs.
- **Innovations:** guided buying and supplier management tied to operational controls.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Commonly evaluated alongside ERP and supply chain platforms for enterprise purchasing governance.

Datavant — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** privacy-preserving data linkage and exchange services supporting cross-entity data collaboration.
- **Typical clients:** payers, life sciences, and provider-adjacent ecosystems.
- **Innovations:** tokenization and linkage approaches for controlled exchange.
- **Geographic client footprint:** North America with expanding international usage. Often used when identity-safe data exchange is required across organizations.

Deloitte — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** strategy-to-execution services for integration, platform modernization, cloud migration, and operating-model design.
- **Typical clients:** large payers and provider systems.
- **Innovations:** accelerators for platform governance, compliance evidence, and modernization roadmaps.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Commonly engaged for enterprise program leadership and complex platform selection.

Denodo — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** data virtualization supporting governed access across distributed data sources.
- **Typical clients:** payers and providers needing federated data access and controlled data products.
- **Innovations:** logical data layers to accelerate integration and reporting without heavy replication.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Often used to support operational reporting and cross-system data access under governance.

Edifecs — Payers

- **Capabilities:** healthcare EDI, payer interoperability, enrollment/claims transaction support, and exchange governance tooling.
- **Typical clients:** health plans and payer service organizations.
- **Innovations:** conformance tooling and transaction lifecycle controls supporting throughput and auditability.
- **Geographic client footprint:** strong in North America with broader deployments. Often selected where EDI and payer interoperability operations are critical.

Epic — Providers

- **Capabilities:** provider clinical platform ecosystem with extensive integration needs into enterprise operations and external exchange.
- **Typical clients:** hospitals and IDNs.
- **Innovations:** ecosystem integration patterns and operational interoperability across large deployments.
- **Geographic client footprint:** primarily North America with international growth. Included in provider integration-to-operations discussions; excluded from payer vendor sets.

Google Cloud — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** cloud infrastructure, data platforms, AI services, and integration-adjacent services (including API and event architectures).
- **Typical clients:** payers and providers modernizing data engineering and platform operations.
- **Innovations:** scalable data processing and AI-enabled operations automation patterns.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Often chosen as a foundation for modern interoperability programs.

Guidehouse — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** healthcare advisory and delivery services across integration, operations transformation, compliance, and technology modernization.
- **Typical clients:** providers, payers, and public-sector healthcare entities.
- **Innovations:** operating-model design and program governance frameworks.
- **Geographic client footprint:** strongest in North America with expanding footprint. Often engaged to align platform initiatives with operational constraints.

HealthEdge — Payers

- **Capabilities:** payer core administration and related platform functions.
- **Typical clients:** health plans modernizing claims, enrollment, and administrative operations.
- **Innovations:** configurable payer platforms designed for modernization and integration.
- **Geographic client footprint:** primarily North America. Commonly evaluated where core admin transformation drives the integration roadmap.

Health Gorilla — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** interoperability and data exchange services supporting network connectivity and clinical data access patterns.
- **Typical clients:** providers, payers, and digital health organizations needing exchange connectivity.
- **Innovations:** exchange onboarding and standardized data access workflows.
- **Geographic client footprint:** primarily North America. Often considered for connectivity acceleration in exchange programs.

HCLTech — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** integration delivery, managed services, platform modernization, and infrastructure operations for healthcare.
- **Typical clients:** large provider systems and payers seeking scale delivery and managed run-state operations.
- **Innovations:** automation and operational governance patterns for platform services.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Commonly used for long-run integration operations and transformation delivery.

Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** infrastructure platforms and edge-to-cloud operations supporting enterprise integration environments.
- **Typical clients:** providers and payers with hybrid infrastructure needs.
- **Innovations:** edge compute and operational resilience patterns.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Often part of foundational infrastructure modernization behind platform programs.

IBM — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** integration middleware, automation, security tooling, and enterprise operations platforms.
- **Typical clients:** large enterprises including healthcare organizations with complex operations.
- **Innovations:** automation, governance, and enterprise-grade integration patterns.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Often evaluated for enterprise-scale operations modernization and regulated integration programs.

IBM Maximo — Providers

- **Capabilities:** enterprise asset management supporting facilities, biomed, and asset lifecycle operations.
- **Typical clients:** hospitals and multi-site provider systems.
- **Innovations:** predictive maintenance patterns and mobile work execution.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Often integrated with ITSM and enterprise operations stacks.

Infosys — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** integration delivery, modernization, managed services, and platform engineering for healthcare enterprises.
- **Typical clients:** large payers and providers with complex ecosystems.
- **Innovations:** industrialized delivery frameworks and automation-led operations.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global delivery with strong North America presence. Often engaged for enterprise-scale integration and transformation programs.

Informatica — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** data integration, data quality, governance, and master data management supporting operational data discipline.
- **Typical clients:** payers and providers with complex data landscapes and compliance demands.
- **Innovations:** metadata-driven governance and data quality automation.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Frequently deployed as a governance backbone for operational data engineering.

Ivanti — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** IT operations and service management used in regulated enterprise environments.
- **Typical clients:** provider and payer IT organizations needing service workflows and endpoint operations governance.
- **Innovations:** workflow automation for IT operations with integrated controls.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Often considered in ITSM tool rationalization affecting platform operations.

Infor — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** enterprise operations platforms (finance, supply, workforce) plus healthcare interoperability and integration tooling.
- **Typical clients:** health systems and payer-adjacent enterprises seeking enterprise operations and integration alignment.
- **Innovations:** workflow-embedded automation and industry-focused operational suites.
- **Geographic client footprint:** North America with international deployments. Positioned where enterprise operations and interoperability are evaluated as one program.

Kong — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** API gateway and API lifecycle tooling used for secure exchange and developer enablement.
- **Typical clients:** payers and providers standing up API programs and partner ecosystems.
- **Innovations:** high-performance gateways and service connectivity for modern architectures.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Often deployed alongside iPaaS/integration engines for complete API governance.

InterSystems — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** interoperability platforms and data integration foundations used in healthcare ecosystems.
- **Typical clients:** providers and regional health networks, plus select payer integration programs.
- **Innovations:** high-performance interoperability and data platform approaches for healthcare.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Frequently selected for interoperability-centric architectures and large-scale healthcare integration.

KPMG — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** audit, risk, compliance, and technology advisory supporting platform governance and operating-model design.
- **Typical clients:** payers and providers undergoing modernization with strong control requirements.
- **Innovations:** control evidence frameworks and transformation assurance models.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Often engaged where auditability and compliance evidence are central to platform change programs.

Lyniate (Rhapsody) — Providers

- **Capabilities:** healthcare integration engine and interoperability platform used for interface lifecycle management.
- **Typical clients:** hospitals and health systems operating multi-vendor environments.
- **Innovations:** integration tooling designed for healthcare standards and operational management.
- **Geographic client footprint:** North America with international deployments. Positioned where interface operability and safe change control are top priorities.

MEDITECH — Providers

- **Capabilities:** provider clinical platform with integration requirements into enterprise operations and exchange ecosystems.
- **Typical clients:** hospitals and provider networks.
- **Innovations:** modernization pathways and interoperability connections into broader ecosystems.
- **Geographic client footprint:** primarily North America with international presence. Included in provider analyses where clinical-to-ops integration is in scope; excluded from payer vendor sets.

Microsoft (Azure + Dynamics 365) — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** cloud platform, integration services, security tooling, and enterprise applications supporting operations and workflow automation.
- **Typical clients:** providers and payers modernizing cloud, integration, and enterprise operations.
- **Innovations:** AI-enabled workflow automation and broad platform extensibility.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Often used as a foundation for integration, observability, and enterprise operations stacks.

MuleSoft (Salesforce) — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** API-led integration, iPaaS, and API management used to scale partner and internal integration.
- **Typical clients:** payers and providers building integration platforms with strong governance needs.
- **Innovations:** reusable API assets and governance patterns.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Frequently selected for enterprise-grade API programs and integration modernization.

NextGen Healthcare (Mirth Connect) — Providers

- **Capabilities:** integration engine used widely for healthcare interface management and standards handling.
- **Typical clients:** providers and provider IT teams needing efficient interface operations.
- **Innovations:** broad ecosystem connectivity and practical interface lifecycle tooling.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global with strong North America presence. Often selected where interface reliability, speed of change, and operational manageability are core drivers.

Nuvolo — Providers

- **Capabilities:** facilities and asset operations workflows supporting provider enterprise operations.
- **Typical clients:** hospitals and health systems modernizing facilities/biomed service operations.
- **Innovations:** configurable workflows for asset-intensive operations.
- **Geographic client footprint:** North America with growing international presence. Evaluated as part of provider enterprise operations and service management modernization.

Okta — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** identity and access management supporting secure platform access and partner governance.
- **Typical clients:** providers and payers with distributed user populations and strict access control needs.
- **Innovations:** identity federation and policy enforcement for modern cloud/hybrid stacks.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Used to strengthen access governance in integration and workflow platforms.

Oracle — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** enterprise cloud applications, databases, integration tooling, and healthcare platform components.
- **Typical clients:** large providers and payers consolidating enterprise platforms and integration foundations.
- **Innovations:** enterprise-scale governance and modernization toolchains.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Often positioned where finance/operations platforms and integration modernization are part of one roadmap.

Orion Health — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** interoperability and data exchange platforms supporting network integration and operational data movement.
- **Typical clients:** providers, regional networks, and ecosystem exchange programs.
- **Innovations:** exchange enablement and interoperability accelerators.
- **Geographic client footprint:** international (notably NZ/UK/NA). Often evaluated for exchange-oriented interoperability initiatives.

Pegasystems — Payers

- **Capabilities:** BPM, case management, and workflow orchestration used heavily in payer operations.
- **Typical clients:** health plans modernizing UM/prior auth and administrative workflows.
- **Innovations:** decisioning and automation integrated into governed workflows.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global with strong enterprise adoption. Positioned for touch reduction and cycle-time improvement programs.

Planon — Providers

- **Capabilities:** facilities and workplace management platforms used for healthcare estates and operational services.
- **Typical clients:** hospitals and multi-site provider organizations.
- **Innovations:** integrated workplace/asset workflows and service execution.
- **Geographic client footprint:** strong in Europe with global footprint. Evaluated for estates modernization alongside EAM/ITSM.

Qlik (Talend) — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** data integration and data quality tooling used for operational pipelines and governance.
- **Typical clients:** payers and providers needing integration of distributed datasets with quality controls.
- **Innovations:** pipeline automation and quality enforcement.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Used to support operational reporting and governed data movement programs.

Redox — Providers

- **Capabilities:** healthcare integration acceleration, connectivity, and operational management for interoperability use cases.
- **Typical clients:** provider organizations and digital health ecosystems needing faster connectivity.
- **Innovations:** streamlined onboarding and operationalized connectivity patterns.
- **Geographic client footprint:** primarily North America. Positioned where time-to-connect and integration operability are central requirements.

Reltio — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** master data management used for identity and entity resolution across ecosystems.
- **Typical clients:** payers and providers needing strong data stewardship and cross-system consistency.
- **Innovations:** cloud-native MDM and relationship-driven models.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Deployed to stabilize member/patient/provider master data in operational platforms.

Salesforce Health Cloud — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** CRM and workflow enablement integrated with automation and exchange patterns.
- **Typical clients:** payers and provider enterprises modernizing service operations.
- **Innovations:** configurable workflows and ecosystem integrations.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Often paired with integration platforms to orchestrate cross-system tasks and evidence handling.

SAP — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** enterprise ERP, procurement, and platform services used for operations modernization.
- **Typical clients:** large provider systems and payer enterprises with complex operations.
- **Innovations:** enterprise governance and process standardization patterns.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Evaluated where enterprise operations consolidation is a priority.

SAS — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** analytics and decisioning platforms used in operational risk, fraud, and enterprise reporting contexts.
- **Typical clients:** payers and large provider enterprises.
- **Innovations:** governed operational decisioning integrated into workflows.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Connected to integration and workflow platforms to operationalize analytics outputs.

SS&C Health — Payers

- **Capabilities:** payer administration and operational platforms used for claims and related functions.
- **Typical clients:** health plans and payer service organizations.
- **Innovations:** configurable administrative platforms with integration ecosystems.
- **Geographic client footprint:** North America with broader enterprise presence. Evaluated in payer core modernization programs.

ServiceNow — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** enterprise workflow orchestration, IT service management, and operational automation used to run cross-system work.
- **Typical clients:** providers and payers standardizing workflows, SLAs, and evidence capture.
- **Innovations:** enterprise workflow platforms and automation for operations governance.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Used as the workflow layer that converts integration signals into controlled work execution.

Surescripts — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** medication-related network connectivity and transaction exchange services.
- **Typical clients:** providers, pharmacies, and payers participating in medication workflows.
- **Innovations:** network-scale transaction routing and interoperability services.
- **Geographic client footprint:** primarily U.S. Relevant where medication exchange intersects with enterprise workflows.

Snowflake — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** cloud data platform used for operational data engineering, governed data products, and cross-domain reporting.
- **Typical clients:** payers and providers modernizing data pipelines and analytics.
- **Innovations:** scalable data sharing patterns and modern data engineering approaches.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Used to centralize operational data while integration platforms deliver upstream ingestion.

Tata Consultancy Services (TCS) — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** integration delivery, modernization services, managed operations, and platform engineering.
- **Typical clients:** large payers and providers with multi-year transformation programs.
- **Innovations:** automation-driven delivery and operations frameworks.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Selected for scale delivery and managed service models.

Solace — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** event broker and messaging platform enabling event-driven integration and operational signal distribution.
- **Typical clients:** enterprises requiring low-latency, reliable event propagation including healthcare.
- **Innovations:** event mesh architectures and resilient messaging.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Paired with integration engines and streaming platforms in modern interoperability architectures.

Tecsys — Providers

- **Capabilities:** supply chain management platforms for provider environments, including inventory and distribution workflows.
- **Typical clients:** hospitals and IDNs focused on supply optimization.
- **Innovations:** healthcare-focused supply workflows and distribution intelligence.
- **Geographic client footprint:** North America with international deployments. Integrated into ERP and POU ecosystems.

Tietoevry Care — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** health and welfare platforms and integration services in select European markets.
- **Typical clients:** public and private healthcare organizations and payer-adjacent entities in-region.
- **Innovations:** regionally aligned platform modernization and exchange enablement.
- **Geographic client footprint:** strongest in the Nordics and parts of Europe. Considered where regional ecosystems shape platform selection.

Workato — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** automation and integration enabling rapid workflow integration across SaaS ecosystems.
- **Typical clients:** payers and providers wanting faster cross-system automation.
- **Innovations:** recipe-based automation with operational controls.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Used to accelerate workflow integrations where lighter automation is preferred.

UKG — Providers

- **Capabilities:** workforce management and HR operational platforms integrated into provider operations.
- **Typical clients:** hospitals and health systems managing staffing scale and labor complexity.
- **Innovations:** workforce scheduling and time management automation.
- **Geographic client footprint:** primarily North America with global presence. Integrated with enterprise operations and workflow platforms.

Workday — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** enterprise HCM and financial management integrated with platform ecosystems.
- **Typical clients:** provider systems and payer enterprises standardizing HR and finance operations.
- **Innovations:** unified enterprise operations platform with extensibility.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Included in enterprise operations modernization programs with significant integration needs.

Verato — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** identity resolution and entity matching supporting patient/member/provider identity consistency.
- **Typical clients:** providers and payers improving identity reliability across ecosystems.
- **Innovations:** identity intelligence integrated with operational governance.
- **Geographic client footprint:** primarily North America with broader adoption. Deployed to reduce mismatches that create workflow exceptions and compliance risk.

WSO2 — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** API management and integration tooling supporting governance, security, and lifecycle controls.
- **Typical clients:** enterprises needing open, customizable integration stacks.
- **Innovations:** configurable governance and developer enablement.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Evaluated as an alternative to proprietary API management suites.

Wipro — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** integration services, cloud modernization, and managed operations.
- **Typical clients:** payers and providers seeking scale delivery and platform reliability.
- **Innovations:** automation for operations and standardized delivery frameworks.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Engaged for modernization execution and long-run platform support.

Zelis — Payers

- **Capabilities:** payment operations and related workflow platforms serving payer administrative processes.
- **Typical clients:** health plans and payer partners.
- **Innovations:** payment workflow modernization and operational controls.
- **Geographic client footprint:** primarily U.S. Integrated with core admin and reporting stacks.

Zscaler — Both Payers and Providers

- **Capabilities:** cloud security, secure access, and zero-trust networking.
- **Typical clients:** providers and payers with distributed users and cloud adoption.
- **Innovations:** zero-trust access control for modern platform stacks.
- **Geographic client footprint:** global. Used to strengthen security posture for integration platforms and operational data environments.

ABOUT BLACK BOOK MARKET RESEARCH

Black Book Research is a healthcare-focused market intelligence and client experience surveying organization that has published vendor-agnostic evaluations of healthcare technology and services since 2011, including sustained coverage of interoperability, connectivity, and integration-focused vendors serving both provider and payer environments. As integration performance increasingly determines patient flow, clinical-to-operations execution, financial control, and administrative throughput, Black Book's purpose is to translate verified end-user experience into decision-grade comparative intelligence that healthcare IT leaders can use for procurement, governance, and strategic planning.

VENDOR-AGNOSTIC, USER-LEVEL INTELLIGENCE BUILT FOR REAL-WORLD DECISIONS

Black Book's benchmarking approach is designed to move beyond reputation and marketing claims by prioritizing user-level performance signals and KPI-based evaluation. The goal is to provide measurable comparisons that reflect run-state realities—reliability under load, operational observability, safe change governance, audit-ready controls, implementation predictability, and measurable outcomes. This KPI emphasis aligns with how healthcare CIOs, CISOs, integration leaders, and operations executives define "production readiness" for platforms that underpin interoperability and operational execution.

METHODOLOGY APPROACH ALIGNED TO INTEROPERABILITY AND INTEGRATION PERFORMANCE

Black Book's research design emphasizes structured benchmarking using standardized performance measures, segment-aware interpretation, and data integrity controls intended to reduce noise and strengthen defensibility. For interoperability and integration categories, the methodology typically focuses on operationally testable performance characteristics such as:

- **Integration operability:** uptime behavior, monitoring maturity, incident response discipline, and resolution speed
- **Safe change velocity:** versioning discipline, regression prevention, rollback readiness, and change governance
- **Standards handling and conformance:** consistency of standards implementation and predictable partner onboarding
- **Security and auditability:** traceability across transactions, access governance, and control evidence capture
- **Implementation and value realization:** time-to-stabilize, adoption enablement, and measurable performance improvements

This structure supports comparisons that reflect not only feature availability, but the ability to operate integration as industrial infrastructure over time.

2026 MISSION: INDUSTRY AWARENESS WITH PROTECTED INDEPENDENCE

Black Book's 2026 mission for this category is to raise industry awareness of what truly differentiates integration and operational data engineering platforms in healthcare—through clear KPI definitions, segment-specific evaluation (providers vs payers), and transparent reporting designed for executive decision-making. A core requirement of this mission is safeguarding independence: benchmarking outputs are positioned to remain structurally protected from vendor influence, with results intended to reflect end-user experience rather than commercial participation.

To preserve credibility, the methodology and reporting posture are framed to avoid pay-for-performance dynamics. Vendor influence through payments, subscriptions, licensing, or consulting is not positioned as a mechanism for altering survey operations, respondent inputs, KPI weighting, or rank outcomes. This separation is essential in interoperability and integration categories, where marketing narratives are common, but healthcare IT leaders require defensible measures tied to run-state performance and measurable outcomes.