

DHMSM RFP Questions and Responses Matrix
(October 22, 2014)

ID	Information Request	DHMSM PMO Response
0001	<p>The Factor 1 Gate Criteria states:</p> <p>"For the purposes of Factor 1 (including sub-factors), Gate Criteria, Best-of-Suite (BoS) refers to an integrated inpatient and outpatient electronic health record (EHR) solution with software components that have been designed, integrated, maintained, and deployed with a design architecture that allows for access to and sharing of a common data model, common user interfaces, common workflows, and common business rules, and that supports end-to-end healthcare related clinical and business operations."</p> <p>We do not believe this definition requests a single solution suite from a single OEM vendor. It is our interpretation that this language allows bidders to select best in class components from more than one vendor for the inpatient and outpatient EHR solution. In particular, this allows bidders to purposely select proven components to achieve the objectives of the DHMSM program while providing for a standards-based open systems architecture allowing for integration and deployment to test on Day 1 of the DHMSM program.</p> <p>With this interpretation, it is implied that more than one vendor product could be identified within the "product name/module" field for BoS requirements in the Product Capability Matrix Attachment 2-6.</p> <p>We believe this interpretation of the BoS verbiage is correct and in the best interest of the Government, as it allows bidders to incorporate best in class modules for inpatient and outpatient requirements while allowing for enhancements designed to meet the unique needs of the DoD."</p>	<p>The definition of BoS solution does not require a solution from a single product line; however, the proposed BoS solution must satisfy the entire definition to be acceptable. The Government will not make a pre-determination as to whether the proposed solution will satisfy the RFP requirements.</p>
0002	<p>Comment: Per Section L, Sub-Factor 2.3, the requirement to provide Attachment ##, Software Licensing Disclosure, has been added to the artifacts that must be provided with Factor 2. Question: Will the Government please confirm that this attachment is outside the 400 page limit for Factors 2 and 3?</p>	<p>Attachment 3, Software Licensing Disclosure will be excluded from the page limitations in a forthcoming amendment to the RFP.</p>
0003	<p>The Section 508 compliance requirements included in Attachment J-3-2 [Req ID 59] Government Requirements Traceability Matrix, and in reference to the Rehabilitation Act and FAR Final Rule issued on 25 April 2001, as outlined on the government's website, www.section508.gov/ are not defined with enough clarity for contractors to respond with an efficient and executable plan to meet them. What are the specific requirements for Section 508 that our bid systems are supposed to meet?</p>	<p>Section 508 technical standards are available at www.section508.gov/section-508-standards-guide. It is incumbent on the offeror to determine which standards apply depending on the types of EIT to be delivered with its solution.</p>
0004	<p>Re: n00039-14-R-0018.pdf, section L volume 6: contract documents, support contractor proposal access consent (b) pg 105. How are proprietary bidders to submit proposals that contain totally secret content, which requires prime contractor status to implement the intellectual property across this entire ghmsm rfp?</p>	<p>Offerors shall submit proposals in accordance with Provision L-10. The Government will appropriately safeguard all proprietary proposal information. Offerors shall NOT include any classified information with their proposals.</p>
0005	<p>Re: n00039-14-R-0018.pdf, section L volume 6: contract documents, factor 4 past performance pg 98. How can past performance claims for implementation of past stolen intellectual property by organized crime be protected from disclosure?</p>	<p>The Government will appropriately safeguard all proprietary proposal information.</p>
0006	<p>The Government has removed the sentence "Offerors may claim small business credit for Subcontractors to the third tier, which will be reflected in the Offeror's Small Business Subcontract Plan" and placed it in the discussion of the Department of Defense (DoD) Comprehensive Subcontracting Test Program. Is it the Government's intention to still allow Offerors to receive small business credit for third tier subs?</p>	<p>Offerors may claim small business credit for subcontractors to the third tier. Section (3) of Factor 5 is not intended to be specific to the DoD Comprehensive Subcontracting Test Program. This will be clarified in a forthcoming amendment.</p>
0007	<p>The Government references CDRs throughout the RFP, the PWS, Task Order 0001, and Task Order 0002, yet does not directly specify where in the response to Section L a Contractor should provide its approach to addressing CDRs.</p>	<p>Proposals are only required to address requirements listed in Section L.</p>
0008	<p>The Government is requiring an automated cybersecurity scan of the entire proposed EHR system [BoS and BoB(s)] with the Assured Compliance Assessment Solution (ACAS) tool, yet does not indicate which programming languages can be read by the tool.</p>	<p>The offeror is not required to scan source code for its proposal. The ACAS tool scans the solution's environment for vulnerabilities. The link provided in Section L contains links to instructions and user guides for the ACAS tool.</p>
0009	<p>The Government is requiring an automated cybersecurity scan of the entire proposed EHR system [BoS and BoB(s)] with the Assured Compliance Assessment Solution (ACAS) tool, yet does not indicate which programming languages can be read by the tool.</p>	<p>The offeror is not required to scan source code for its proposal. The ACAS tool scans the solution's network environment for vulnerabilities. The link provided in Section L contains links to instructions and user guides for the ACAS tool.</p>
0010	<p>As DHMSM will be the System of Record for medical records for DoD, the Offeror will need to know what the Systems of Record will be for DHMSM.</p>	<p>DHA Systems of Records are listed at the following website: http://www.tricare.mil/tma/privacy/RoleoftheTMAPrivacyOffice.aspx#som</p>
0011	<p>The government's change to Past Performance requirements represents a more qualitative review of an offeror's recent and relevant past performance which both helps establish technical merit and overall costs of similar EHR implementation and deployments.</p>	<p>Your comment has been noted.</p>
0012	<p>One issue that has plagued the current EHR is the instability of the existing infrastructure. Medical Network Community of Interest (MedCOI) may have a capability that can provide the interoperability required as a platform for a New EHR.</p>	<p>Your comment has been noted. Information about the network environment is described in the DHMSM Data Communications Network and Enterprise Services Infrastructure Framework in the Technical Data Repository.</p>
0013	<p>Due to the commercial nature of the requested solution, a number of companies are commercial companies and will not be able to provide a sealed bid package with indirect rate information. What information would the government like to receive to assist in the demonstration of the price reasonableness of proposed commercial rates?</p>	<p>Offerors shall provide sufficient information to substantiate costs/prices presented in the proposal, indicating a realistic and complete understanding of the requirements of this solicitation. It is incumbent on the offeror to provide enough detail in quantitative and supporting information to allow the Government to assess the reasonableness, completeness, and realism of proposed costs. The burden of proof as to cost credibility rests with the offeror. Offerors shall provide all information required by Section L.</p>
0014	<p>The Government has moved the statement that the Offeror may claim small business credit for Subcontractors to the third tier from paragraph (4) to paragraph (3) in this section. Please confirm ALL Offerors may claim small business credit for Subcontractors to the third tier, whether or not they participate in the DoD Comprehensive Subcontracting Test Program.</p>	<p>Offerors may claim small business credit for subcontractors to the third tier. Section (3) of Factor 5 is not intended to be specific to the DoD Comprehensive Subcontracting Test Program. This will be clarified in a forthcoming amendment.</p>
0015	<p>Do the minimum DHMSM Subcontracting Goals stated in section in Factor 5 (4) apply to all Offerors, whether or not they participate in the DoD Comprehensive Subcontracting Test Program?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
0016	<p>52.224-1 Privacy Act Notification. In accordance with FAR 2A.J4.103(b), please provide, in accordance with agency procedures, a copy of any specific agency rules and regulations implementing the Privacy Act.</p>	<p>Privacy Act rules and regulations regarding DHA are available at: http://www.tricare.mil/tma/privacy/privacyact.aspx</p>

DHMSM RFP Questions and Responses Matrix (October 22, 2014)		
ID	Information Request	DHMSM PMO Response
0017	The RFP specifically calls for EHR system scans using ACAS. The Government response to Question 2250 indicated that the offeror is responsible for acquisition of the tool. While ACAS is fundamentally the Tenable Nessus and Security Center products, it is technically not ACAS when acquired commercially. Since the ACAS tool is only available through a PKI-enabled web page AND requires a license key that can only be requested by an authorized Government sponsor, we request that the government confirm it will accept scans from the commercially acquired Nessus tool. If scans from the commercially acquired tool Nessus tool are not acceptable, will the Government provide a license key for ACAS?	The Government will accept scan results from the commercially acquired Nessus tool, as long as the commercial tool is configured in the same manner as the ACAS tool. It is incumbent upon the offeror to ensure all requested information in Section L, Sub-factor 2.4 is provided. This will be clarified in a forthcoming amendment.
0018	Attachment 26, Government Furnished Property is not included in the RFP files posted on August 25, 2014.	Reference to Attachment 26 will be removed from Attachment 1, IDIQ PWS in a forthcoming amendment to the RFP.
0019	RFP Factor 6 states "Offerors are not expected to propose a cost against every element of the WBS if that element is not applicable to their unique solution." This language could possibly result in the omission of critical program requirements and invalidate the evaluation model if an offeror does not solution a comprehensive plan for production and non-production environments over the full 10 years of the program.	Offerors are required to propose a cost against every element required to their proposed solution.
0020	RFP documents do not identify the location of the Government's test staff. Will the Government test staff be located in the GALs in the vicinity of Puget Sound?	Yes.
0021	The Government changed the NCR Facility requirement to "maintain a facility within 15 miles of the DHMS PEO ... within 30 days after issuance of the Task Order". What does the Government mean by the word "maintain"? It will be very difficult for Contractors to get a facility leased and operational within 30 days. Would the Government please revise this section to allow at least 60 days as stated in Draft #3?	The contractor shall establish new or utilize existing facilities as described in IDIQ PWS Section 5.1.1 to facilitate coordination with the Government. Attachment 1, IDIQ PWS will be revised in a forthcoming amendment to the RFP to allow for 60 days.
0022	To support the clinical data exchange requirements, is the contractor required to provide the exchange system? Or, would the contractor integrate with an existing exchange system?	To support clinical data exchange requirements, the contractor will be required to interface the DHMSM solution with the DMIX VLER eHealth Exchange, as well as utilize its own organic eHealth Exchange interface to provide bidirectional eHealth Exchange connectivity with external partners. Additional information can be found in Section 3.3 Interfaces with External Organizations of the DHMSM Interface Strategy located in the Technical Data Repository.
0023	Will the DoD be the repository for all military service member health care records (with and without the TRICARE system)?	Yes, the DoD will be the repository for all military service member health care records, whether the care was provided in an MTF or via an external healthcare provider organization.
0024	The IDIQ PWS, section 5.1.11 and CDRL Details Rev1, indicates the contractor needs to develop a transition plan (CDRL A019) 9 months after contract award; however, there is no tasking in TO1 or TO2. Please clarify when the transition plan should be delivered.	The services required by Paragraph 5.1.11 of the PWS are not being ordered with Task Orders 0001 and 0002. The CDRL would be due within the timeline specified once invoked on a future task order. This will be clarified in a forthcoming amendment.
0025	Would the government consider extending the current total timing requirement for the usability video walkthroughs from 10 minutes to 30 minutes? The requisite steps per scenario across the 19 scenarios may be captured within a 10 minute timeframe. However, Evaluators may be challenged with grasping the context for the Offerors selection of screens in such an abbreviated timeframe. Extending the timeframe to 20 minutes would enable the Offeror to better capture key navigation components and convey context to Evaluators for select screens and how they relate to the evaluative HIMSS usability factors.	This will be revised in a forthcoming amendment.
0026	Please clarify the statement 'MHS personnel include activated members of the National Guard and Reserve, estimated at 50,000 additional personnel. Members of the National Guard and Reserve are typically activated about one month out of the year.' Is the 50,000 for a month included in the total 153,000 or are they in addition to the 153,000?	The 50,000 is in addition to the 153,000.
0027	Offerors shall provide evidence of meeting small business goals on prior contracts. By Prior Contracts, does the government mean the Prime's contract citations used in the past performance volume?	The offeror may discuss how it met small business goals on any prior contracts, including those cited in the past performance factor.
0028	There are several references in the PWS regarding the submittal of source code, including PWS Section 5.2.2 (b), (d) and (f), Section 5.2.6.3 (e), CDRL A023, and Section 5. Some of these references appear to be applicable to non-commercial software only, and others to all software. Would the Government please confirm that commercial source code is required only for the purposes of cybersecurity and software assurance scans as described in Section 5.2.2 (f)?	Commercial source code is only required for PWS Section 5.2.2(f)
0029	In Section 5.2 k.i, the Government states that "the EHR system shall be capable of accommodating and scaling to meet increased user demand beyond that in the Government RTM to meet DoD mission requirements (e.g., large-scale activation of the National Guard in response to a national disaster)...". Furthermore, it states that the contractor understands and agrees that any increase in user demand beyond that identified in the Government RTM will not entitle the contractor to an equitable adjustment to, or constitute a Government breach of, this contract. Please confirm this requirement (increased user demand) only applies to temporary surge demand resulting from these unforeseen DoD mission requirements. If so, please provide a maximum duration (e.g., 3 months) the contractor will be required to accommodate the surge (increased user demand) before an equitable adjustment would be considered. This offeror understands and supports the DoD's need for flexibility during such times. However, if this requirement is unbounded, offerors must plan for this unknown capacity in their proposal which potentially drives excess cost. This offeror recommends deletion of this provision, or at a minimum, for proposal purposes, will the Government please specify the expected user growth that the contractor should plan for and the duration for which the surge must be covered before an equitable adjustment is reasonable?	This requirement remains as stated. As stated in the IDIQ PWS, the EHR system must be capable of "accommodating and scaling to meet increased user demand." The Government cannot provide any additional information about unforeseen DoD mission requirements at this time. In the event additional scaling is required, the Government would place the appropriate task orders.
0030	Given that Attachment 26, Government Furnished Property has been removed without an adequate baseline for all bidders, only the legacy system contractors are able to propose solutions with optimize current investments. Request that bidders be allowed to make reasonable assumptions of current software infrastructure.	All offerors must propose a solution that meets all RFP requirements without assuming any Government-Furnished Property unless otherwise specified in the RFP.
0031	DFAR 252.239 - 2018. Specifically in regards to "DFAR 239.7302 Definitions", please advise how the EHR system falls under the definition of "Covered System".	The EHR System would not be a "Covered System" as defined in the DFARS.

DHMSM RFP Questions and Responses Matrix (October 22, 2014)		
ID	Information Request	DHMSM PMO Response
0032	What (HL7 or other non industry standard) message volumes do you have today that could help the contractor to size configurations of messaging infrastructure? Would the Government please specify any available message volumes or provide a rough-order of magnitude estimate for sizing purposes?	The DHMSM Data Communications Network and Enterprise Services Infrastructure Framework document Appendix 5 provides AHLTA transaction usage metrics, AHLTA transaction volumes and MTF usage metrics. MTF code listing also provides users per MTF location.
0033	<p>The DHMSM PMO response to question 2233 states that "The Government is providing the Tier 1 hosting solution in accordance with an updated DHMSM Data Communications Network and Enterprise Services Infrastructure Framework, available in the Technical Data Repository as part of the final RFP". Within the Data Communications Network and Enterprise Services Infrastructure Framework document, the following website link to Information about the DISA Server Hosting and Virtualization service offering is provided. http://www.disa.mil/Services/Computing/Server-Hosting-and-Virtualization</p> <p>This link contains text that states "Hardware Services is a mandatory service that is billed when DISA provides the hardware. It includes the cost of the hardware itself, the OS (and any virtualization software if applicable), standard maintenance, and miscellaneous items such as racks and cabling. For legacy hardware, this rate covers the cost of depreciation. There are occasional circumstances where partners are allowed to provide their own hardware; however, this is increasingly rare and requires approval from senior management."</p> <p>The use of commodity hardware may not provide the performance required for the applications to optimally perform to meet service levels and may incur more cost. Does the Offeror have the flexibility to supply the hardware if this can be provided at a reduced cost?</p>	Offerors are required to complete Attachment 24, Enterprise Hosting Template and specify the DISA services sufficient to meet all requirements specified in the RFP. For purposes of proposals, offerors do not have the flexibility to supply such hardware in the Tier 1 environment.
0034	<p>The DHMSM PMO response to questions states that "The Government is providing the Tier 1 hosting solution in accordance with an updated DHMSM Data Communications Network and Enterprise Services Infrastructure Framework, available in the Technical Data Repository as part of the final RFP". Within the Data Communications Network and Enterprise Services Infrastructure Framework document, the following website link to Information about the DISA Server Hosting and Virtualization service offering is provided. http://www.disa.mil/Services/Computing/Server-Hosting-and-Virtualization</p> <p>This link contains text that states "Hardware Services is a mandatory service that is billed when DISA provides the hardware. It includes the cost of the hardware itself, the OS (and any virtualization software if applicable), standard maintenance, and miscellaneous items such as racks and cabling. For legacy hardware, this rate covers the cost of depreciation. There are occasional circumstances where partners are allowed to provide their own hardware; however, this is increasingly rare and requires approval from senior management."</p> <p>The use of commodity hardware may not provide the performance required for the applications to optimally perform to meet service levels and may incur more cost. Does the Offeror have the flexibility to supply the hardware if this can be provided at a reduced cost?</p>	Offerors are required to complete Attachment 24, Enterprise Hosting Template and specify the DISA services sufficient to meet all requirements specified in the RFP. For purposes of proposals, offerors do not have the flexibility to supply such hardware in the Tier 1 environment.
0035	<p>Attachment 24 is used to show pricing for servers, storage, and other services. Servers are priced only on the basis of number of sockets. The number of cores per socket and processor speeds can vary greatly between server types. As a result, there is high possibility that the specification of servers by number of sockets may result in improper sizing of the system. Should the number of cores and processors be ignored for both physical Operating Environments (OEs) and virtual OEs? Does the Government have a default number of cores and processor speeds that should be assumed. The DISA services website also indicates adjustments to the VOE's may be warranted as illustrated in the following text:</p> <p>"Therefore when a VOE (often referred to by their brand name, such as an HP iVM or a Sun Logical Domains) utilizes 4 or more cores which equals 1 socket on HP Itanium hardware or 8 or more cores on Sun SPARC hardware which also equals 1 socket, they will be charged Basic and Hardware Services at Level 3 or above depending on the number of cores allocated and how many sockets those cores equate to, using the level definitions. For example, an iVM (Itanium Virtual Machine) allocated 10 cores would consume greater than 2 sockets and would be categorized as a Level 4 OE."</p> <p>What guidance can the Government provide regarding when adjustments should be made (e.g., when an OE utilizes more than some number (e.g., 4) of cores? Also are adjustments limited to only VOE's and not OEs?</p>	<p>For proposal purposes only, the defaults are as follows:</p> <p>x86 VOE maximum is 8 vCPUs x86 is 8 Cores per Socket - Core processor speed is 2.54 Ghz Non x86 is 16 cores per socket - Core processor speed is 1.4 Ghz</p> <p>Attachment 24, Enterprise Hosting Template will be updated in a forthcoming amendment. The Government will not consider offeror-proposed VOE adjustments inconsistent with the above during evaluation.</p>
0036	<p>Which of the following DISA computing services are required versus optional?</p> <p>Basic Services - implied to be mandatory Hardware Services - implied to be mandatory Database Services - implied to be optional Application Support - implied to be optional 24x7 System Administration - implied to be optional Recurring non-rate-based services - implied to be optional</p>	<p>Server Basic - Mandatory Hardware Services - Mandatory Database Software - Mandatory if using DB's at Tier 1 Storage - Mandatory Additional Services (24x7 System Administration) - Solution dependent; Offerors may provide these services with their own labor or utilize DISA services.</p>
0037	For Attachment 24, is it correct to assume that inputs for the additional (optional) Application Support and Database Administration Services are not required if these services are provided and priced separately as part of the Offerors proposal?	If Application Support and Database Administration Services are required at Tier 1, offerors may provide these services with their own labor or utilize DISA services.
0038	In the introduction to Task Order 0002 - the Government indicates "IOT&E Phases 1 and 2 will use the Test Data Center". Is it correct to assume that the production sites would point to the TDC vs. DISA initially for IOT&E Phases 1 and 2?	It is not correct to assume that the production sites would point to the Test Data Center. The offeror's solution must be capable of operating regardless of where the data is located.

DHMSM RFP Questions and Responses Matrix (October 22, 2014)		
ID	Information Request	DHMSM PMO Response
0039	The final RFP makes FAR 52.245-1 applicable to Firm Fixed Price CLINs, and 52.245-1 Alt I applicable to Cost Plus Incentive, Fixed Price Incentive, Cost Plus Fixed Fee, and Cost Reimbursement CLINs. The difference between FAR 52.245-1 and 52.245-1 Alt I is that the Government assumes risk of loss of Government property under the basic clause, whereas the Contractor assumes risk of loss under the Alt I clause. However, FAR 45.104 states that..."contractors are not held liable for loss of Government property under the following types of contracts: (1) Cost-reimbursement contracts; (2) Time-and-material contracts; (3) Labor-hour contracts; (4) Fixed-price contracts awarded on the basis of submission of certified cost or pricing data." Therefore, it appears that all applicable Government property is covered under the basic clause, 52.245-1. Would the Government please consider deleting the Alt I clause?	This will be revised in a forthcoming amendment.
0040	Sub-factor 2.3: Interoperability & Open Systems Architecture (OSA) requests four interfaces to be modeled in six DoDAF views that need to be included in the proposal. These views when modeled and placed into the proposal are posing to be difficult to meet the page formatting restrictions of 10 pt font and 8.5" x 11" page size. Additionally, the models consume a large amount of the overall page count. Will the Government please exempt the DoDAF models from page count allowed for Volumes 2 and 3?	This will be revised in a forthcoming amendment.
0041	In PWS Section 5.1.3.1.a, the Government requires that "The Kickoff Meeting shall be held at a contractor-provided facility in accordance with IDIQ PWS Section 5.1.1.1..." If the contractor is establishing a new facility in response to requirement 5.1.1.1, it may not be available in time to support the kickoff meeting in 15 days. We assume the contractor can hold the Kick Off meeting in another Arlington, VA facility if the NCR facility in 5.1.1.1 is not yet ready. Please confirm.	Any contractor-provided facility meeting the requirements of PWS Section 5.1.1.1 can be used for the kickoff meeting.
0042	We appreciate the Government's collaboration and transparency to date, however, given the size, complexity and importance of this acquisition, we believe an extension to the due date will improve proposal quality and reduce the need for questions during evaluation. Additional time is critical to allow offerors to develop comprehensive technical proposals, detailed BOEs, and complex pricing information. This will also provide time to incorporate pending information expected to be released in answers to questions and a forthcoming amendment. This offeror respectfully requests extension of the proposal due date from October 9, 2014 to October 28, 2014.	The Government will take requests for extensions into consideration; however, at this time the proposal due date remains 9 October 2014.
0043	The Government indicates in Table L-1 File Naming Conventions of the RFP that 3.3 Product Capability should be submitted as *.pdf formatted file. Subfactor 3.3 requires offerors to complete Attachment 19, Product Capability Matrix which is an excel file. Does the government require the offeror to convert Attachment 19 from excel to pdf format for submission or will the government accept completed Attachment 19 in .xls format? Please clarify.	This will be revised in a forthcoming amendment to allow for *.xls file formats in Sub-factor 3.3.
0044	Will the Government provide corresponding Cost/Price ID Numbers to the current WBS numbers in Tab "(1) Cost-Price by WBS" to ensure that offerors provide the Government with a standardized estimate per WBS line number?	As stated in Section L-8, Factor 6, Attachment 4, PWS-WBS-CLIN Mapping is provided for guidance only to assist offerors in tracing the WBS to the appropriate sections of the IDIQ PWS and related CLINs. Offerors are not bound by Attachment 4. For this reason, the Government intentionally did not include the Cost/Price ID column in Tab 1.
0045	Will the Government consider providing offerors with an unlocked version of Attachment 16 to enable Offerors to conduct cost and price related verification and validations?	Attachment 16, Cost-Price Evaluation Template may be unprotected by selecting the 'Unprotect Sheet' button on the 'Review' tab.
0046	What is the preferred format to show the detail for all Cost Type CLINs? Is it the Government's intention for offerors to provide detail to all Cost Type CLINs in accordance with FAR 15.408, Table 15-2?	Offerors shall provide sufficient information to substantiate costs/prices presented in the proposal, indicating a realistic and complete understanding of the requirements of this solicitation. The burden of proof as to cost credibility rests with the offeror. FAR 15.408, Table 15-2 contains instructions for submitting cost/price proposals when certified cost or pricing data are required; certified cost or pricing data is not required in this solicitation. Instructions on how to submit detail for cost-type CLINs are provided in Section L, Factor 6 and Attachment 16, Cost-Price Evaluation Template.
0047	What is the preferred format to show the detail for all Fixed Priced CLINs with the Attachment 16 - Cost Price Evaluation Template? Is it the Government's intention for offerors to provide a breakout of Indirect Rates applied for Fixed Price CLINs?	Offerors shall provide sufficient information to substantiate costs/prices presented in the proposal, indicating a realistic and complete understanding of the requirements of this solicitation. The burden of proof as to cost credibility rests with the offeror. With regard to indirect rates for Fixed Price CLINs, offerors shall follow instructions in Section L, Factor 6 (2)(b)(v).
0048	Are the monthly rate prices NTE amounts? To provide the Government with a best value solution, are offerors permitted to offer monthly rates lower than those stated in the spreadsheet?	Rates provided in Attachment 24, Enterprise Hosting Template are for evaluation purposes. Offerors shall NOT change the rates provided.
0049	The current Instruction in the referenced section "The sum of cells D18-D26 must be equal to or less than the value listed in D8" is contradictory to how the calculation is currently tabulated within Tab "Tier 1 - Enterprise (Hosted)." Will the Government provide revised instructions or an updated model?	There is no contradiction. The sum of the total services in the referenced cells shall not exceed the total number of operating environments per year, Cell D8.
0050	The current Instruction in the referenced section "The sum of cells D28-D32 must be equal to or less than the value listed in D8" is contradictory to how the calculation is currently tabulated within Tab "Tier 1 - Enterprise (Hosted)." Will the Government provide revised instructions or an updated model?	The sum of the total services in the referenced cells shall not exceed the total number of operating environments per year, Cell D8.
0051	The current Instruction in the referenced section "The sum in cell D34 must be equal to or less than the value listed in D8" is contradictory to how the calculation is currently tabulated within Tab "Tier 1 - Enterprise (Hosted)." Will the Government provide revised instructions or an updated model?	The total service in the referenced cell shall not exceed the total number of operating environments per year, Cell D8.
0052	The current Instruction in the referenced section "The sum in cell D35 must be equal to or less than the value listed in D8" is contradictory to how the calculation is currently tabulated within Tab "Tier 1 - Enterprise (Hosted)." Will the Government provide revised instructions or an updated model?	The total service in the referenced cell shall not exceed the total number of operating environments per year, Cell D8.
0053	Will the Government provide the appropriate SCA Wage Determination to be used as required within the Direct Labor Worksheet?	SCA Wage Determination is contingent upon the offeror's proposed solution, approach, and workforce. For any labor category proposed that is covered by the Service Contract Act (SCA), offerors shall provide the SCA occupation code, title, and identify the applicable wage determination.
0054	Direct and Indirect Rate History: Is it the Government's intention to review historical Direct Labor/Salary and Travel information for the direct costs proposed?	Yes.

DHMSM RFP Questions and Responses Matrix (October 22, 2014)		
ID	Information Request	DHMSM PMO Response
0055	Is it the Government's intention to have offerors submit a CAS Disclosure statement as part of the proposal submission, or to have the statement on file and available?	Offerors are required to provide all information required in K-4. The solicitation will be amended to require submission of a CAS Disclosure Statement.
0056	Given the large amount of detailed documentation released with the final RFP that requires review and/or response, will the Government extend the proposal submission deadline by two weeks?	The Government will take requests for extensions into consideration; however, at this time the proposal due date remains 9 October 2014.
0057	In order for offerors to review and address all final solicitation and referenced technical data repository documents, will the Government please extend the deadline for submitting questions by two weeks?	The Government will take requests for extensions into consideration; however, at this time the proposal due date remains 9 October 2014.
0058	PWS 5.2 (a) requires configuration with minimal development. Will the Government provide one or two examples of the expected development for the offeror's response to PWS 5.2(a)?	Any development activities are contingent upon the offeror's proposed solution and any customization required for it to meet all requirements.
0059	The Government's Attachment 19 spreadsheet does not allow offerors to indicate if the solution was customized. Does the Government want offerors to include development with their proposed solution?	The option "Does Not Support" under the "Level of Configuration Required" column addresses customization to support a capability.
0060	Does the Government want offerors to provide a narrative response that explains how the work under PWS 5.1 Program Management will be accomplished? If yes, will the government provide instructions on where it wants the offerors to include this narrative? How will the Government provide information on how the offerors solution to PWS 5.1 will be evaluated?	Offerors shall only provide the information required by Section L of the solicitation.
0061	Will the Government confirm that the current OSA Guidebook referenced in PWS 5.2.1 is located in the Technical Data Repository?	The OSA Guidebook is available in the TDR and at: https://acc.dau.mil/ad/en-US/664093/file/73330/OSAGuidebook%20v%201_1%20final.pdf
0062	Is annual software maintenance, for each stage (Stage 1-8) to be calculated on software orders placed, regardless of deployment of that software, or to be calculated on actual software in use?	Software maintenance will cover the actual enterprise, regardless of the estimated size of the Stage, during the term of the ordered Stage in accordance with clause H-2. Software maintenance for each Stage will be ordered on an annual basis for a twelve (12) month term at the Firm-Fixed-Price in the appropriate CLIN.
0063	If First Data Bank (FDB) is a required element of the DHMSM solution, is this considered Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) or will the Contractor need to license this separately?	All offerors must propose a solution that meets all RFP requirements without assuming any Government-Furnished Property unless otherwise specified in the RFP. The offeror is responsible for providing all software licenses required for its proposed solution to fulfill requirements in accordance with Section H-2.
0064	Since the Government is requesting commercial off the shelves products under this RFP, would the Government add commercial items clauses to Section I of the RFP including but not limited to 52.212-3-5, 52.212-13 etc.?	This requirement is being solicited under FAR Part 15. The clauses identified are either already addressed or only applicable to FAR Part 12 contracts.
0065	H.2 Enterprise Software License and Maintenance states the following: Non-Enterprise Software Licenses. The contractor is authorized to order from existing Department of Defense Enterprise Software Initiative (DoD ESI), Enterprise Software Agreements (ESAs), Department of the Navy (DON) Enterprise Software Licensing (ESL) Agreements, or Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative SmartBuy Enterprise Software Agreements for the purpose of procuring / providing non-EHR software licenses and software maintenance in the performance of this contract. Will the Government make available the agreements so Offeror can make price assumptions?	DoD enterprise software agreements are available at: http://www.esi.mil/ . SmartBuy enterprise software agreements are available at: http://www.gsa.gov/portal/category/25726 .
0066	Clause I-16 Earned Value Management System - This clause should not be applicable to subcontractors providing commercial products. Please confirm.	Flowdown and applicability to subcontractors will be determined at the time of award in accordance with I-16. I-16 is not applicable to Firm-Fixed-Price subcontracts.
0067	Section L of the RFP requires the submission of a CSDR Plan in Volume 6 of the offeror's proposal. Please confirm that submittal of the CSDR Plan is a contract deliverable and not part of the proposal submission. To adequately meet the requirements of Section L, please clarify what specific items are to be submitted in Volume 6 as part of the CSDR Plan.	The CSDR Plan is required for proposal submission in accordance with Section L, Volume 6 (4). Required elements are provided in Attachment 6, Cost and Software Data Report - CSDR.
0068	From the data included within Column (a) of the CSDR Plan, and the accompanying submission dates, it is assumed the government is requesting four (4) distinct reports for each of the CCDR related CDRs (CWBS Dictionary, CSDR, FCHR, SRDR): 1) Investment Segment 1 2) Investment Segment 2 Unique 3) Sustainment Segment 1 4) Sustainment Segment 2 Unique Does the Government want each of the CCDR related CDRs for each of the following: 1) Investment Segment 1; 2) Investment Segment 2 Unique; 3) Sustainment Segment 1; 4) Sustainment Segment 2 Unique; which would be 16 individual reports?	Yes, there are sixteen (16) individual reports.
0069	The PWS requires the flow down of CCDR requirements to applicable subcontractors. If subcontractors are providing only commercial services and items, are they exempt from the CCDR requirements?	All software data, including commercial software data provided by subcontractors, must be included in the CSDR. See DoD 5000.04-M-1.
0070	The Final RFP has numerous references to Telehealth that imply significant integration of a telehealth solution with the EHR. For example: RTM 004 Screening - "In the MHS, telehealth is defined as the use of telecommunications and information technologies to provide health assessment, treatment, diagnosis, intervention, consultation, supervision, education, and information across distances. Telehealth is leveraged to provide world-class care across the globe including deployed locations for service members, family members, retirees, and other eligible beneficiaries." RTM 0017 Emergency Services "Includes the ability to transmit and capture via Telehealth." Questions: -Does the Government have applicable standards or technical specifications associated with the above definitions of telehealth?	The Government has not defined any specific standards or technical definitions associated with the definitions of telehealth in Attachment 2, Government Requirements Traceability Matrix.
0071	Please clarify if there is a difference between OT&E in PWS 1.3.2 and IOT&E in TO-0002?	Both terms refer to the same Operational Test and Evaluation event. Clarification will be provided in a forthcoming amendment.

DHMSM RFP Questions and Responses Matrix (October 22, 2014)		
ID	Information Request	DHMSM PMO Response
0072	In TO-0002 Section C 1.0 Overview the government states "After the Limited Fielding for Initial Operational Capability (IOC) Authority to Proceed (ATP) decision, which must occur by December 31, 2016, the Government will conduct Operational Test and Evaluation (OT&E) at the IOC sites for Segment 1 and Operational Medicine Mockup for Segment 2". Does this mean that to all IOC facilities will be activated by December 31, 2016 or a subset of facilities?	At least a subset of the facilities must be activated by December 31, 2016 but Task Order 0002 is not complete until all IOC facilities are deployed.
0073	Will the government evaluate a DoD or US Government developed/adapted/configured "additional capability" more favorably than a commercial, State, or other customer developed/adapted/configured "additional capability"?	The Government will evaluate any 'additional capability' on its own merits in accordance with Sections L & M.
0074	Will the government evaluate published APIs more favorably than vendor proprietary APIs? If not, does the government anticipate vendor APIs will be or included or outside of the license agreements?	The Government considers APIs to be interfaces and will evaluate interfaces as described in Section M, Sub-factor 2.3. DHMSM IP related to interfaces is addressed in clause H-8, DHMSM IP License Agreement.
0075	With the removal of the Attachment 26, Government Furnished Property, is it the government's intent to retire any developed products, to include software, currently deployed and operational in DOD environments (eg. such as Integrated Clinical Database (ICDB) ?	The EHR System will replace functionality of core legacy systems as described in the RFP.
0076	How does DHA intend to handle Privacy Act System of Records Notification in the Federal Register ? Will the contractor's proposed system constitute a new System of Records or will DHA be updating an exiting System of Records Notice (and if so, which SORN) as appropriate and in accordance with Privacy Act requirements?	The solution from any resultant contract will constitute a new System of Record.
0077	The requirements for Utilization Management have expanded significantly from RFP draft 3, including requiring significantly more functionality in the area of billing. In order to properly review and incorporate the requirements into vendor solution as well as properly price the solution, vendor is requesting a 35 day extension to the RFP timeline. Can the timeline be extended to November 13, 2014?	The Government will take requests for extensions into consideration; however, at this time the proposal due date remains 9 October 2014.
0078	A third party is defined as "any party other than the Government and the Contractor. A third party license is a license not executed directly between the Government and the Contractor." Does this definition of 3rd party subcontractor apply to subcontractors at any tier? For example, the prime contractor enters into a licensing agreement with a first-tier subcontractor software provider who in turn has licenses with other software vendors at the second or third-tier.	For purposes of provision K-13, a third party would include subcontractors at any tier.
0079	Task Order 1 states "...performance under Task Order 0001 concludes when DT&E Testing is successfully completed, ..." The DHMSM Test Strategy, Figure 3-1 shows the IPR/POTRR and SVR/OTRR as required to end DT&E. These reviews are included in the scope of Task Order 2. Can the Government please clarify the expected testing and SETR events included in the scope of each task order?	The DHMSM Test Strategy is a referenced document in the IDIQ PWS and not a contract attachment. The solicitation and attachments take precedence in accordance with FAR 52.215-8 -- Order of Precedence -- Uniform Contract Format.
0080	In Section L-8 E. Proposal Content the Government instructs offerors that "all files and content shall be provided on DVD+R(s). How many sets of DVDs are offerors required to deliver?	One (1) DVD or one (1) set of DVDs if the proposal will not fit on one DVD.
0081	Page 102 of RFP, Section L, Factor 6, paragraph c) requires "All proposal prices shall be based on the Government Fiscal Year (Oct – Sep)." This is the only reference to pricing by GFY while all Attachment 16 cost inputs and summary spreadsheets require prices by contract year in accordance with Section B CLINS and ordering periods. The contractor believes that requiring pricing by GFY is not intended and would represent essentially two proposals, one for contract year and one for GFY. Request the Government delete this sentence.	Offerors shall submit only one proposal. Pricing should be based on Government Fiscal Year, but should be included in proposals by contract year (i.e., the RFP assumes a contract award date of June 2015, Contract Year 1 would be a blend of Government Fiscal Years 2015 and 2016).
0082	In Use Case scenario 3.3 it states medical encounters are documented on hard copy temporary records. Does the government intend to continue to document on hard copy records or do you want the ability to create a temporary electronic medical record for local national patients?	The use case scenarios capture a vignette of the "as-is" direct delivery environment. The Government requirements for the DHMSM EHR solution are reflected in Attachment 2, Government Requirements Traceability Matrix.
0083	Please clarify the intent behind H-3(c)2 and K-13.d.2. The sections state "...the Government will need rights to use, modify, release, display, disclose and distribute commercial computer software and commercial technical data associated with interfaces and training outside of the Government for DHMSM Purposes..." Please confirm this scope of license is ONLY applicable to CS, TD and CSD, in all cases which are "associated with interfaces and training..." That is, the Contractor is not required to offer such a broad license to CS, TD and CSD in general.	The scope of H-3.c.2 and K-13.d.2 is limited to commercial technical data, commercial computer software, and commercial computer software documentation associated with interfaces and training.
0084	Section 2.2.5. of the DHMSM license defines DHMSM IP as NON-commercial software, and CS "that is associated with interfaces" or "training". Therefore, we assume the applicability sentence in Section 1 which states that the Agreement applies to "all" DHMSM IP means: non-commercial software (with other than Unlimited or GPR), and CS, but only that CS associated with either (i) interfaces or (ii) training). Please confirm our assumption that this license is ONLY applicable to the limited IP referenced in Section 2.2.5, and that other CS will be only subject to their standard terms (so long as not in conflict with federal law). This interpretation also seems consistent with Section 3.4 of the License.	Clause H-8, DHMSM IP License Agreement is only applicable to DHMSM IP as defined in Section 2.2.5 of the clause. Any technical data, computer software, or other intellectual property being delivered under the contract that is not DHMSM IP as defined in clause H-8 will be handled in accordance with DoD regulatory policy as defined in the DFARS, and in accordance with the FAR/ DFARS clauses in the contract.
0085	We understand the Government is requesting DHMSM IP rights to the Interfaces which the Government has defined as follows: A mechanism that provides the means to exchange data between a data publisher and one or more data consumers. This will generally include necessary hardware, network connectivity, software, protocols, and data processing components. Thus, Interfaces will include the mechanisms to connect with the other proposed solutions. We understand and seek to confirm that DHMSM IP does not include common user interfaces.	This definition is not from the current version of the Interface Strategy provided in the Technical Data Repository. The definition may not include common user interfaces depending on what the offeror means by that phrase.
0086	We believe that one of the key objectives of this project is Interoperability. How is interoperability explicitly addressed within the context of the requirements stated in this RFP? Data Governance, for example, is not addressed, in terms of how the selected contractor can contribute and provide guidance and instructions to ensure that interoperability is realized and a proper release management strategy can be executed.	System interoperability is addressed throughout the solicitation. The EHR System will enable the application of standardized workflows, integrated healthcare delivery, and data standards for improved and secure electronic exchange of medical and patient data between the DoD and its external partners, including the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), and other Federal and private sector healthcare providers.
0087	Does the government have an existing SSO or Context Management system already in place? If a new system is required, can you please provide a list of external systems to which you want to share context and include in single sign on? Is it the offerors' responsibility to mitigate external systems that do not support commercially standard APIs or industry standards for these solutions?	The Government does not currently have an existing enterprise SSO or Context Management system in place. The DHMSM Interface Strategy identifies Enterprise Systems (Figure 3.1) that directly support point of care delivery. These systems comprise the currently known list of systems that will be required to share context and be included in single sign on. As the Government continues to determine the standardized enterprise business processes, additional clinical systems may be identified that require SSO or Context Management. It is the offeror's responsibility to address interface requirements to external systems that do not support commercially standard APIs or industry standards for these solutions.
0088	In Usability Demo Scenario 4, User 5, steps 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 are intended for a Pharmacy Technician and steps 5.4, 5.5, and 5.6 are intended for a Pharmacist. Can you please clarify if we're to show two users, or just one with combined functions?	The Government requires the roles to be met by actors trained at the appropriate level or higher. If appropriate, multiple roles may be met by a single actor.

DHMSM RFP Questions and Responses Matrix (October 22, 2014)		
ID	Information Request	DHMSM PMO Response
0089	The Usability video requirements state that each file must be saved as a .mpg file which corresponds to MPEG-1 and MPEG-2 formats only. However, the requirements state that the video must be encoded using MPEG-4/H.264. The MPEG-4/H.264 requirement would imply a .mp4 extension rather than .mpg. Can you confirm that the video files should be saved in .mp4 format rather than .mpg?	This will be revised in a forthcoming amendment.
0090	Would the government please confirm that the DHMSM Deployment POC task, "Identify all training facilities required to include all supporting materials" refers to the identification of training rooms as well as materials such as tables, computers, projectors, etc.?	The required supporting materials are solution dependent.
0091	Would the government please confirm that "End user training completed for system operation" as entrance criteria to the Development Test and Evaluation phase refers to the completion of training materials for review by testers?	The entrance criteria stated refers to the completion of training for test users.
0092	The DD254 limits certain DHMSM roles and access to certain information to U.S. citizens. DoDD 5200.2-R defines U.S. citizen as "A person born in one of the 50 United States, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Northern Mariana Islands, U.S. Virgin Islands; or the Republic of Panama (former Panama Canal Zone) (if the father or mother (or both) was or is, a citizen of the United States)." NISPOM lists acceptable forms of proof of U.S. citizenship for natural-born citizens, naturalized citizens, and citizens born abroad to a U.S. citizen parent. Please clarify whether "U.S. citizen" in the DD254 includes natural-born citizens, naturalized citizens, and/or citizens born abroad to a U.S. citizen parent.	Natural-born citizens, naturalized citizens, and/or citizens born abroad to a U.S. citizen parent are eligible for national security positions provided the individual proves U.S. citizenship and favorably completes an appropriate investigative and adjudicative process.
0093	The DD254 states that a secret facility clearance is required. Given that commercial vendors would not typically hold facility clearances, please clarify that this requirement applies to the prime contractor and not to subcontractors. If the requirement does apply to subcontractors, please clarify what type of facility clearance is required.	The solicitation requires the Prime contractor to have a SECRET facility security clearance. If additional facility clearances are required, this would be addressed after contract award.
0094	In nonfunctional RTM 0228 the government requires that "the system shall be capable of processing all stages of the billing lifecycle for medical services." There are a series of tasks that must occur in all billing systems to meet this requirement. These include the capture and pricing of charges, leveraging demographic, insurance, charge, and coding information to create an electronic claim, calculating the expected reimbursement using reimbursement contracts, loading an electronic payment, providing patients an estimate of their expected amount due, sending the patient a statement (paper and electronic statements), collecting payments, and reporting on and tracking key Revenue Cycle Measures such as AR. Please clarify if the government is requiring all functions needed in the billing lifecycle to be provided in the DHMSM solution. If not all functions are included please clarify which functions the government is requesting proposals include.	The Government requirement is specified in Attachment 2, Government Requirements Traceability Matrix and clarified in column D. The requirement remains as stated.
0095	In RTM 23 you request the ability to generate patient statements and in RTM 42 you request "patient level cost accounting" within the proposed DHMSM solution. By this do you also mean to include the precursory steps such as coding and pricing as functions within the DHMSM solution?	The Government requirement is specified in Attachment 2, Government Requirements Traceability Matrix and clarified in column D. The requirement remains as stated.
0096	In RTM 23 you request the ability to generate patient statements and in RTM 42 you request "patient level cost accounting" within the proposed DHMSM solution. Is it the intention of the government that vendors provide the needed functionality to allow the DHA to complete the entire lifecycle of billing functions within the boundary of the proposed DHMSM solution?	The Government requirement is specified in Attachment 2, Government Requirements Traceability Matrix and clarified in column D. The requirement remains as stated.
0097	Regarding this RTM clarification, pertaining to the Utilization Management capability: "Defense Medical Information System (DMIS) ID: It is a unique identification code assigned by the Defense Health Agency (DHA), which identifies past and current DoD medical facilities. This information is updated monthly, with availability going back several years. Full Time Equivalent (FTE) is the number of hours worked that add up to one full-time employee." Please clarify how the DMIS ID and FTE information will be used in the billing process.	These are definitions only. The Government requirement for billing is specified in Attachment 2, Government Requirements Traceability Matrix line 23 and clarified in column D.
0098	Section H-5 of the RFP allows the government to release contractor Confidential Business Information to support contractors and subcontractors. Given the sensitivity of the information subject to release under this provision, please clarify that the restrictions included in H-5 would be in addition to the terms and conditions included in the non-disclosure agreement specified at DFARS 227.7103-7. Similarly, in addition to providing the company names and points of contact to which it plans to release such information, would the government also provide a copy of the non-disclosure agreement executed by each recipient of such information?	Clause H-5 will be modified in a forthcoming amendment to also require execution of the Use and Non-Disclosure Agreement specified at DFARS 227.7103-7 and include providing a copy of any executed Non-Disclosure Agreements to the DHMSM contractor upon request.
0099	The requirement to address Key Personnel is located in Volume 6, which is evaluated solely as a pass/fail. While it is important for the Offerors to include Key Personnel commitment letters in this Volume, there is no method for the Government to have any qualitative evaluation of Key Personnel -- especially the Program Manager -- to determine the skill level of Contractor personnel to credibly manage one of the largest ACAT 1D MAIS programs in recent history.	This is a performance based contract. Sections L&M intentionally focus on the offeror's technical and product solution rather than the resumes for key personnel.
0100	While the Government has provided specific requirements for Key Personnel, the Government has provided no method for evaluation, making Key Personnel essentially a pass/fail.	This is a performance based contract. Sections L&M intentionally focus on the offeror's technical and product solution rather than the resumes for key personnel.
0101	While the Government has listed eight Key Personnel, there may be a requirement for additional Key Personnel to provide a high quality of service.	The requirement remains as stated.
0102	The Clinical Informaticist listed in the PWS 5.1.2, Figure 5-1 states this person must "assist in the optimization of the EHR System in support of clinical, business, and Operational Medicine mission of the DoD" and "at least 5 years demonstrated experience implementing, training, and optimizing the contractor EHR to support an integrated inpatient/outpatient health system network. Industry as well as HIMSS defines a "Clinical Informaticist" as one a person with responsibilities for "analyzing, designing, implementing, and evaluating information and communication systems that enhance individual and population health outcomes, improve patient care, and strengthen the clinician-patient relationship". This Government's definition is inconsistent with industry's standard for same. Many highly qualified Clinical Informaticists do not have direct experience with EHRs, but more commonly support the HIT professionals in the implementation of HIT (including EHRs).	Your comment has been noted.
0103	Attachment 24 provides pricing for DISA services per the DISA Service Catalog.	Attachment 24, Enterprise Hosting Template is for proposal evaluation purposes only.
0104	The due date for the Cost and Software Data Reporting System (Attachment 6) is unclear. It may be advantageous to the Government to have this due upon award or project start date.	The CSDR Plan is required for proposal submission in accordance with Section L, Volume 6 (4).

DHMSM RFP Questions and Responses Matrix (October 22, 2014)		
ID	Information Request	DHMSM PMO Response
0105	Section 2.2.1. reads ""SPECIFICALLY NEGOTIATED LICENSE RIGHTS" or "SNLR" means the rights to: i. Access, use, modify, reproduce, release, perform, display, or disclose DHMSM IP within the GOVERNMENT without restriction". Please confirm these rights will be exercised by the Government for DHMSM purposes only.	Within Government, the SNLR cited in clause H-8 allows the Government to use, modify, reproduce, release, perform, display or disclose DHMSM IP without restriction. DHMSM IP may only be used outside of Government for DHMSM Purposes.
0106	Given the text in PWS Section 5.1.10.3 and the corresponding sections in the PWSs for Task Order 1 and Task Order 2, would the Government please confirm that contractor personnel working on Task Orders 1 and 2, including access to the TDC sandbox, will require personnel clearances of Public Trust?	All personnel associated with this contract shall occupy a position of public trust and shall have completed an appropriate background investigation.
0107	In Attachment 24, Enterprise Hosting Template, should all proposed storage capacity, e.g., local storage, SAN storage, database storage, be included in either the Basic Local Service and Server Basic Remote Services entries or should only local server storage be included in this attachment? If only local server storage is to be included, where should pricing for other storage, such as database storage, be included?	Storage proposed should be included at the tier it will be physically located. For example, all storage at Tier 1 should be accounted for in the Tier 1 Tab. (Basic Local Service and Server Basic Remote Services). Tier 2 through 4 tabs should indicate the storage required at those tiers. All storage (DB, SAN, HD) is required to be accounted for in Attachment 24, Enterprise Hosting Template.
0108	In the final RFP, the Government provided Attachment 4, PWS-WBS-CLIN Mapping. In addition, in Section B several the CLIN descriptions provide reference to the applicable PWS elements. There are inconsistencies in this data. For example, PWS 5.2.9 in Attachment 4 is mapped to WBS 1.1.2 System Engineering and CLINs 0009, 0010, 1012 and 2012. However, in Section B CLINs 1012 and 2012 do not reference PWS 5.2 as applicable scope for that CLIN. Request the Government please update Section B to be consistent with Attachment 4.	Attachment 4, PWS-WBS-CLIN Mapping is provided for guidance only to assist offerors in tracing the WBS to the appropriate sections of the IDIQ PWS and related CLINs. Offerors are not bound by Attachment 4.
0109	Providing Bill of Material (BOM) information as required in Factor 6 Cost/Price Proposal, with each line item applicable to a single PWS, CLIN and price id will result in hundreds or perhaps thousands of lines of detail (depending on how large an offeror's BOM is). Given that BOM information is normally organized by environment and production will be deployed to DISA data centers, would the Government consider removing the requirement for allocation to price id for the BOM items?	The requirement remains as stated.
0110	The RFP states that "The offeror shall identify the five (5) most severe Category I vulnerabilities in the format provided in the PEO DHMS Cybersecurity Strategy (provided in the Technical Data Repository)." The format does not appear to be provided within the final PEO DHMS Cybersecurity Strategy in the TDR. Will the Government please provide the format to use or allow the use of an offeror provided format?	The specific format shall be in accordance with the Technical Report CDRL (A038). Section L will be updated in a forthcoming amendment.
0111	Clarification is requested regarding the clearance levels associated with the work supporting this PWS. The PWS states "All personnel associated with this contract shall occupy a position of public trust and shall have completed an appropriate background investigation. Some of the individual Task Orders issued against this contract shall require personnel having higher clearance levels up to SECRET." Task Order 1 and Task Order 2 do not stipulate that higher clearance levels are required. The RFP does not clearly require SECRET clearances for personnel for TO1 or TO2, however it is stated that IT-1 level access will be required to administer DHMSM systems which requires SSBI. Can the Government please clarify this disconnect and if the requirement for SSBI and Secret level clearance exists for supporting personnel in TO1 and/or TO2.	The requirements of paragraph 5.1.10 of the IDIQ PWS are invoked in both Task Order 0001 and Task Order 0002, including all clearance requirements and investigations.
0112	If the government has enterprise licenses in place in the MTF's such as for CACHE, Draeger and CliniComp for PACU's and OR systems etc. and they will become part of the proposing DHMSM vendor's technical integrated solution—will the government leave them in place and continue to maintain the enterprise licensing agreements and continue to cover those costs so that the proposing vendor does NOT have to price them in their DHMSM bid?	All offerors must propose a solution that meets all RFP requirements without assuming any Government-Furnished Property unless otherwise specified in the RFP.
0113	During the evaluation process, will the RTM be divided into sections for review or will the RTM be evaluated in its entirety? This question is being asked in order to minimize redundancy in the product description. If the document will be reviewed as a whole, then a detailed product description will be provided on the first mention of the product. Then, if the product is repeated for additional capabilities, the product will simply reference the previous description.	No offeror input is required in the RTM.
0114	What is the existing Blood Bank application? Does it support HL7 messaging? Are there any HL7 specifications for that existing system that we may review?	All available information is provided in the Interface Strategy.
0115	Referencing: Definition of Document / Artifact Management Do you expect the vendor to reference the proposed product's Document / Artifact Management capabilities or our ability to interface with the HAIMS system?	The proposed Document/Artifact Management solution must meet all related RTM requirements. Whether an interface to the HAIMS system is necessary is dependent upon the capabilities of the DHMSM EHR solution and the data synchronization strategy between DHMSM and the legacy systems.
0116	What are the instructions to insert the Child process for dental use case scenarios 1 & 2 of the dental use case. Where do we demonstrate this capability within the dental use cases steps.	The Use Case Description defines in detail the steps for each use case scenario. The associated Business Process Models provide a diagrammatic representation of those steps. The Child Processes are repeatable processes (process steps) that can be used within other processes.
0117	The dental child process for gathering data and check in have a read-only notation. The Child Process for Radiographs does not have the Read-Only does not. What impact does this have on the Use Case Videos?	Videos are only required for Sub-factor 3.2, Usability. The Dental Use Case Scenarios are not assessed in Sub-factor 3.2.
0118	If the DoD is using ADA or AMA procedure codes, what code is the DoD using for a dental readiness exam as it pertains to readiness review?	There are no DoD-unique codes within the ADA or AMA procedure code set.
0119	What is the Biometric system currently in place? Will the vendor need to interface with it or want to replace it?	There is no enterprise Biometric system in place. There is no requirement to replace any existing biometric systems.
0120	What is the recruiting database? ABIS? Will the vendor need to interface with it?	There is no requirement for the DHMSM contractor to interface with recruiting databases.
0121	The DHMSM DCN & ESI Framework document states in section 3.3.1 that "DISA operated, DHA managed, Virtual Data Centers (VDCs) located at current DoD Core Data Center locations may be leveraged by the DHMSM contractor as part of its EHR infrastructure and hosting solution." and in section 3.2.6 states "...Med-COI CDCs may include commercial hosting facilities". DISA (in their role as the DOD Enterprise Cloud Services Broker (ECSB)), has the ability to grant Provisional Authorizations to Commercial Cloud Service Providers (CSP's) via the DoD Cloud Security Model (CSM) at Levels 1-6. Referencing section 3.2.6 would infer that CSP's that have been granted Provisional Authorizations up through Level 5 (includes PHI) could be used as infrastructure and hosting environments in support of DHMSM. Can you confirm this?	For Tiers 2 through 4, facilities that have been granted Provisional Authorization up through Level 5 could be proposed as infrastructure and hosting environments in support of DHMSM.
0122	After reviewing Question #79 and the Government's response provided with Amendment 0001, please confirm that DT&E must be completed within TO1 (and therefore within the first 12 months of the program) per Attachment 17, Task Order 0001, Section C1, Scope, and 5.6.4, Developmental Test and Evaluation. With the completion criteria defined in TO1, there seems to be no option that would allow DT&E to extend beyond month 12 (as stated in the EMP and Test Strategy documents provided in the TDR).	DT&E must be completed prior to the end of Task Order 0001.

DHMSM RFP Questions and Responses Matrix (October 22, 2014)		
ID	Information Request	DHMSM PMO Response
0123	Pursuant to a previously answered question issued with amendment 1, if the EHR System is not a "Covered System" as defined in the DFARS, please advise how DFARS 252.239-7017 (Notice of Supply Chain Risk) and DFARS 252.239-7018 (Supply Chain Risk) are applicable to the program?	The DFARS prescription requires the inclusion of 252.239-7017 and 252.239-7018 for the procurement of any information technology system, as defined in 252.239-7018, not just "covered systems".
0124	Currently the government has commercial hardware pricing tied to cost type CLINS. As these are commercial products, purchased on a FFP basis, and not subject to CAS or cost data, would the pricing be best placed under FFP Clins, or would a subclin under the CP CLIN be acceptable?	Offerors shall propose costs/prices in accordance with Section L, Factor 6 and Attachment 16, Cost-Price Evaluation Template. Offerors shall not introduce additional CLINs or SUBCLINs.
0125	With regard to deployment waves outside the United States, can the Government share information on whether Status of Forces Agreements (SOFAs) apply to the deployment waves, and grant tax and other protections and exemptions to the contractor employees, and its subcontractors, and their employees when working in OCONUS locations? This is especially important for the following countries: Germany, Italy, Belgium, Turkey, UK, Korea, Japan, Singapore	In accordance with Attachment 2, IDIQ PWS, Section 4.1, the contractor shall comply with host nation agreements for performance of any work in OCONUS locations. Future task orders requiring performance OCONUS will contain information specific to each host nation where work is to be performed.
0126	Because software maintenance is purchased from the same supplier as the software license and given the high proportion of software license and associated maintenance of the overall contract price, will the Government amend the exclusion of small business content from the total contract value to read: "For purposes of this Factor, the total contract value is the total proposed Cost/Price for the contract excluding proposed license and maintenance prices (CLINs 0005, 0006, 0007, 0008, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1008, 1009, 1010, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 3005, and 3007)."	The requirement remains as stated.
0127	Section F states: "The IDIQ contract and Task Order 0001 will be awarded concurrently. Task Order 0001 will satisfy the contract's minimum guarantee as defined in Section G." Section L requires Offerors to respond to a subset of of the invoked PWS sections for Task Order 0001. Please confirm whether or not Offerors are required to provide responses to all PWS requirements not explicitly referenced in Section L for Task Order 0001.	Offeror's proposals shall address only the information requested in Sections L and M.
0128	Is the offeror required to submit a signed Business Associate Agreement (BAA) with its proposal, or is the BAA only required to be executed by the successful offeror at the time of contract award? If the BAA is required with proposal submission, in what volume and section should it be included?	Business Associate Agreements (BAAs) are not required for submission with proposals.
0129	In Amendment 2, the response to Question 0083 was "The scope of H-3.c.2 and K-13.d.2 is limited to commercial technical data, commercial computer software, and documentation associated with interfaces and training. Are constrained items to be described in Section L, Sub-factor 2.3(4) and listed in Factor 6(5) Data Rights-Supplemental Price List limited to just interfaces and training?"	Constrained items, as defined by Section L-8, Sub-factor 2.3(4)(b), are not limited to items related to interfaces and training. A constrained item includes: 1) each item of non-commercial technical data (TD), computer software (CS), or computer software documentation (CSD) the offeror lists in K-11 with rights having more constraints than Specifically Negotiated License Rights (SNLR), as defined in clause H-8, DHMSM IP License Agreement, and 2) each item of commercial TD, CS, or CSD listed in K-13 associated with interface and training deliverables with rights having more constraints than SNLR, as defined in clause H-8, DHMSM IP License Agreement.
0130	The Offeror is required to "provide copies of all commercial licenses(s) to commercial TD, CS, or CSD, including third party licenses, that the Offeror proposes to deliver under this contract." If each licensor executes an agreement that expressly grants to the Government the licenses required by H-8, is the offeror also required to attach each licensor's standard commercial license (which it does not intend to use vis-a-vis the Government)?	Offerors shall only submit licenses which it proposes for use under the contract.
0131	Are you releasing a revised Attachment 24 conformed to Amendment 2? or is the current version on the SPAWAR e-Commerce website the current version and should be used by offerors in developing the pricing proposals?	The version of Attachment 24 posted to SPAWAR e-Commerce is current.
0132	Offerors are required to address their proposal to the DHMSM Contracting Officer. No name or phone number are provided in Section L-10, but proposal packages being delivered via overnight delivery require a name and phone number to be included with the address. If delivered in person, the offeror must contact the Contracting Officer at least 24 hours prior to delivery. Matthew Hudson at (571) 294-6075 is listed on the SF 33, Block10. Please confirm that his name and number are to be placed on proposal packages, and that he is the government official to contact to coordinate delivery in-person.	Matthew Hudson is the appropriate person to contact and his contact information can be supplied to delivery companies.
0133	Volume 5: Cost/Price Proposal, Section 3 lists the file type as N/A. All other proposal sections are to be provided in either .xls or .pdf. Should Section 3, which is to include Table H-1 filled-in, be submitted in .xls or .pdf?	Table H-1 may be submitted in a .PDF or Microsoft Office format.
0134	The contract type listed in Section B for CLINs 3006 and 3008 is CPFF. In Attachment 16, the contract type for these same CLINs is FFP. Please revise Attachment 16 to reflect that the correct contract type for CLINs 3006 and 3008 is CPFF to eliminate this inconsistency.	Contract types for CLINs 3006 and 3008 in Attachment 16 have been updated and provided in Amendment 0003.
0135	Due to file size, will the Government permit the offeror to submit the IMS as a separate file in either MS Project or as a PDF, using the file name: "factor_2_2_IMS" ?	The IMS must be submitted as a PDF file. The file may be named in accordance with updated file naming conventions provided in Amendment 0003.
0136	The revised language states that the proposal shall include a completed Attachment 24, Enterprise Hosting Template for Stages 1 through 10 as part of the offeror's priced and unpriced BOEs. Offerors are not required to submit substantiating cost/price information such as BOMs or BOEs for costs associated with Government-Provided Tier 1 Data Center/Hosting. For costs identified in Attachment 24 in Tiers 2-4, please clarify if these cost are to be recorded in Attachment 16 and if so under what cost/price IDs.	Costs identified in Attachment 24 for Tiers 2-4 shall be included in Attachment 16 and assigned to the Cost ID and WBS element which is appropriate for the offeror's individual solution. Associated supporting cost information (BOE and BOMs as applicable) shall also be provided for Tiers 2-4 per instructions provided in Section L-8, Factor 6 (2)(b).
0137	IDIQ PWS Section 5.6.2 is invoked in Task Order 0001. Paragraph 5.6.2 (d) of the IDIQ PWS states the contractor will "provide hardware, software, and professional services for installation, configuration, and interfaces of the EHR systems in the GALs." The DHMSM Government-Approved Labs (GALs) Plan, the DHMSM Engineering Master Plan, and the DHMSM Test Strategy Documents all identify that the Government will implement the GALs prior to contract award. Please clarify if the offeror is to propose a hosting environment at Tier 1 as well as Tier 2, 3, and 4 hardware to outfit the GALs. Furthermore Attachment 24 has no tab available to collect costs for hosting hardware and COTS software for use in the GAL's. If the offeror is to provide hardware and software to support a hosting environment in the GALs please clarify where in Attachment 24 these costs should be recorded. In addition please clarify under what Cost/Price ID these costs should be recorded in Attachment 16.	Offerors shall not use Attachment 24 to collect costs for hosting hardware and software for use in the GALs. Per IDIQ PWS 5.6.2(d), offerors shall "provide hardware, software, and professional services for installation, configuration, and interfaces of the EHR systems in the GALs." If necessary for the offeror's solution, such costs, including any costs associated with hosting the proposed solution in the GALs, shall be included in Attachment 16. Offerors shall assign all cost elements to the Cost ID and WBS element which is appropriate for the offeror's individual solution.

**DHMSM RFP Questions and Responses Matrix
(October 22, 2014)**

ID	Information Request	DHMSM PMO Response
0138	<p>Since MARCH I HAVE BEEN TRYING TO ACQUIRE TITLES TO THE various SCRAPPED AIRCRAFT CARRIERS to buy them and have them RE-OUTFITTED AS TELEMEDICINE HOSPITAL SHIPS.</p> <p>The intent is to purchase several and send them to West Africa for the deployment of the telemedicine platform by robotic dirigibles and purchase the empty NYC LICH Hospital to act as the headquarters for this remote robotic medical interactive deployment of 2 way kiosks and the wireless support infrastructure. Hoping that Google . Amazon .. facebook and other techs will sign on..after titles are granted by the government.</p> <p>PLEASE SEND THIS REQUEST UP THE LINE OF COMMAND TO THE NEWLY PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTEE EBOLA CZAR RON KLAIN...for a decision on the title transfer..</p> <p>If approved we could use information on the sea worthiness of these ships and some retired crew.</p>	<p>Your comment has been noted.</p>
0139	<p>Attachment 19 with supporting evidence is required for both Volume 1 (Subfactor 1.3) and Volume 3 (Subfactor 3.3). For Volume 1, the requirement is to submit all content in a single PDF file. For Volume 3, the requirement is to submit all content as an Excel / PDF file.</p> <p>Due to file size and to facilitate navigating through the supporting evidence, will the Government permit the Offeror to submit these files in both Volume 1 (1.3) and Volume 3 (3.3) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attachment 19 as an Excel file (Volume 1 as factor_1_3_bosccapabilities.xls; Volume 3 as factor_3_3_capability.xls) - Narrative / supporting evidence in consecutively numbered PDF files (Volume 1 as factor_1_3_bosccapabilities_#.pdf and Volume 3 and factor_3_3_capability_#.pdf, where # = consecutive numbering as needed) 	<p>For Sub-factor 3.3, any description of capabilities and supporting narrative shall be submitted with the file name provided in Table L-1. Attachment 19 and supporting evidence submitted with Attachment 19 for Sub-factor 3.3 does not count against page limitations and may be provided as separately named files. Offerors only need to submit one completed set of Attachment 19 with supporting evidence to satisfy both Sub-factors 1.3 and 3.3.</p>
0140	<p>Reference Section M, Factor 6 (4): The solicitation describes how the Government will effect price adjustments for constrained items without a listed option price that are not deemed to have achieved the stated objectives of Sub-factor 2.3(4)(a).</p> <p>(a) Can the Government please clarify the standards under which it will determine if a constrained item meets each of these objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Operation, maintenance, and sustainment of the EHR system solution; ii. Modification of interfaces when necessary [as the term "interface" is defined in the DHMSM Interface Strategy; iii. Cybersecurity and software assurance, including access to and scans of the EHR system code; and iv. Training on the EHR system solution. <p>(b) Can the Government please state whether a proposal will be deemed nonresponsive if the Government determines that, because of the Offeror's delivery of constrained items and lack of other options, it cannot achieve its objectives stated in Section L, Sub-factor 2.3(4)(a) throughout the EHR system program lifecycle.</p> <p>(c) In the event that standards requested in (a) above cannot be shared with offerors, will the Government provide offerors with an opportunity to substitute components of lesser capability without constraints prior to the levy of a price adjustment?</p>	<p>The Government will evaluate constrained items in accordance with Sections L and M. Offerors will not be deemed nonresponsive for proposing constrained items with or without option pricing. Constrained items that do not allow the Government to meet the stated objectives in Section L-8, Sub-factor 2.3(4)(a) will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria in Section M. As part of discussions, the Government will notify offerors in the competitive range if price adjustments related to constrained items were applied.</p>