	47QFCA19R0055_MEPCOM USMIRS Solicitation_Q&As		
Question #	Questions from Industry	Government Response	
1	To provide the most relevant pricing information with the requirements currently provided by the government, would the government accept a Rough Order Magnitude (ROM) estimation instead of commercial price list information?	Yes. The Government will also accept previous or historical contract prices, previous invoices, and a link to a published pricing catalog.	
2	If vendors without a readily available commercial list cannot submit an ROM, in what format should vendors submit pricing information?	Please refer to the Government's response to question number 1.	
3	How will the government evaluate vendors with primarily commercial work instead of federal/Department of Defense performance to ensure capabilities are not overlook despite specializing in a different market?	The Government will evaluate each Solution Brief in accordance with the evaluation criteria outlined in section 4.2 of the solicitation.	
4	What is the current size of the USMIRS 1.0 vendor team performing the current work or that developed the current version?	The current size of the USMIRS 1.0 vendor team is 15.	
5	During the information session, it was mentioned that the USMRIS 1.1 development would include User Interface (UI) development along with backend needs for internal system integrations and integration with all other partner systems and platforms. Would USMEPCOM be open to providing a sample list of outstanding UI and backend backlog items to ensure a more thorough response is provided?	USMEPCOM is not able to provide a sample list at this time. However, for the backend, we know that there are approximately 10 internal applications that would need integrating with MIRS 1.1 core application and externally there are almost 20 applications/systems that we would need to build interfaces and provide technical info in order to link system to system and transfer data.	
6	Does USMEPCOM anticipate the existing USMIRS 1.0 dataflow (Application Programming Interfaces, Health Level 7, Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources, and other web services) to carry over to USMIRS 1.1 or is it expected that new dataflow methods will be created by the vendor for USMIRS 1.1?	It is expected that new dataflow methods will be created by the vendor for USMIRS 1.1.	
7	Is the current USMIRS 1.0 dataflow (APIs, HL7, FHIR, and other web services) standard to the USMIRS product or specific to each individual partner system/platform?	There will be some specific customization with each partner system for data exchange because each system is different and have different levels of capability and back end architecture. Some of the systems are very modern; other systems are legacy/outdated and will require high levels of technical coordination with external partners to devise solutions for effective data exchange.	
8	Is there any kind of enterprise service bus running or middleware tools inside of the MIRS family of systems in order to take, manipulate, disseminate, or report on data being sent to/received from any partner systems or platforms?	There is no service bus. MIRS 1.1 data requests will enter our cloud (VPC in AWS) at the elastic load balancer. They're then passed through an Apache server that acts as our web layer to do authentication, and then passed to the app layer that is running ruby on rails. Ruby uses graphql API to do data calls.	

9	As the current vendor we are very much interested in seeing the ultimate success of the MIRS 1.1 initiative. Given our domain knowledge of the technical implementation and also the strong relationships we've built with MEPCOM and MEPS staff we would like to offer 2 possible solution briefs. The first will be for the full project and will meet the criteria outlined in the solicitation. However, if that ultimately does not satisfy the evaluation committee we would like to provide a solution brief which proposes what a transition phase would look like that would allow a potential new vendor to have time to leverage our learning, relationships, and technical knowledge to date. Would submitting two briefs be allowed?	No, please only submit one Solution Brief.
10	The solicitation document is unclear on whether data migration is in scope. During the presentation last week there was a slide presented by Matt Lince that seems to conflict slightly with the document. And, to date, our knowledge has been that another vendor at MEPCOM has been tasked with data migration. Can you clarify?	In accordance with section 2.1, Project Objectives, of the solicitation "the successful offeror will produce additional software upgrades to the existing code base, provide data migration and management". Also, in section 4.2, Evaluation Criteria Criterion III, of the solicitation "the solution brief clearly addresses past experience with enterprise level data and system migration". Thus, data migration is within scope.
11	Similarly, we have been aware to date that another vendor at MEPCOM has been tasked with some of the external integrations (for example, interfacing MIRS 1.1 with some of the aptitude testing products). Is this still the case or are ALL external integrations in scope for the vendor responding to this solicitation?	All external systems will be MIRS 1.1 vendor's responsibility to integrate.
12	Can you clarify MEPCOM's expectations in terms of the team size and makeup that would be provided through the RDT? We are very familiar with the personnel that we have interfaced with to date but during the presentation a larger group was implied. Can you provide some more information around that? It will factor into our response regarding co-location. Additionally, aside from serving as product owners and in assisting with requirements definition, what other activities will MEPCOM/RDT be owning during the next phase of this initiative?	MEPCOM's expects offerors to propose a team size, makeup, labor mix, and skill set that best meets evaluation criteria outlined in section 4.2 of the solicitation. Details of the next phase of this initiative will be provided to those vendors selected to move forward.
13	With our broad knowledge of the systems involved we believe we have a fair grasp on the external integrations. However, to be sure we are responding appropriately regarding staffing and project planning is there a complete list of current MIRS 1.0 external integrations that can be provided?	No, at this time MEPCOM is unable to provide this information.
14	Regarding the IATT and ATO process, is the expectation that the responding vendor would own that entire process including documentation? Or, will MEPCOM/RDT be participating (in part or in full) in the documentation requirements? We have been through the IATT process with MIRS 1.1 but would like some more clarity around expectations moving forward.	Vendor will need to provide majority of effort and responsibility for RMF (IATT/ATO) process, including providing documentation required by Army eMASS system. USMEPCOM will have oversight, approval, and final submission responsibility. As outlined in the solicitation, MIRS 1.1 vendor should provide personnel who have expertise with Federal/DoD RMF process, including experience in cloud network cyber security.

15		It is expected that the vendor will conduct familiarization training prior to, and during, deployment of MIRS 1.1 to our 65 field offices. The familiarization training for users will be a mix of different virtual delivery methods. It is the vendor's responsibility to propose various types of familiarization methods that represent best practices used for deploying new applications and replacing legacy systems.
16	I would like to respond to your CSO opening referenced in the subject line, however, I don't think I can have it ready by November 1st. Would you accept a late response?	In accordance with section 3.1, Submission Requirements, of the USMEPCOM USMIRS solicitation "Solution Briefs received after the specified due date and time will not be evaluated by the Government". Late responses will not be accepted.