**PWS Reference/**

**Attachment #**

**Page number Question Answer**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | INSERT REFERENCE AND/OR ATTACHMENT # PER QUESTION | INSERT ONE QUESTION PER ROW | LEAVE THIS COLUMN BLANK |
| 1 | CPRS Security | For VICS, will the VA require (1) security (access control) and (2) auditing and (3) RPC content encryption so that CPRS is adequately secured, well beyond the level currently available in VistA? | Yes to all three requirements. The objective is to secure CPRS for remote access. This was added to the PWS for clarity. |
| 2 | Storage | “reroute the service layer to the FileMan dataset” – does Fileman have to e used for the service implementations or can a node.js-supporting, industry-standard database such as MongoDB be used instead? | No to “does Fileman have to be used”. Yes to “can a node.js supporting industry-standard database such as MongoDB be used.” This was clarified in the revised PWS. |
| 3 | Cloud deployment | Is there any requirement that the services be cloude-deployable on Azure or Amazon? | Yes. It must be deployable natively, “on the metal” on a commercial cloud service (i.e. not a virtual machine running a separate operating system or database). This was clarified in the revised PWS. |
| 4 | PWS 5.2.1.1 | Does VA have a Node Package Manager (NPM)? If not, will the Contractor be responsible for acquiring and implementing the NPM? | No. VA does not have an NPM. It is the public, industry-standard NPM bundled with the Javascript. |
| 5 | PWS 5.4 | Will VA provide Cybersecurity scanning tools to the Contractor? Will VA allow the Contractor to use other tools thant htose provided by VA? | Not applicable. This is about auditing the existing RPC vulnerabilities. There is no “tool” that does this.. |
| 6 | PWS 5.5 | Will the Contractor be required to prodice site-specific test plans for the IOC sites? | No. |
| 7 | General | To assess the risk associated with the ‘Liquidated Damages for Data Breach Clause, will the contractor that performs this work have access to sensitive personnel information (SPI) or personal health information (PHI)? If yes,  a) Please clarify number of records.  b) Please clarify the specific PWS tasks have the potential for exposure to SPI/PHI  c) Will the team have access to SPI data in production environment? OR How will the contractor be required to handle the SPI/PII data? | Metadata from production clones will be used. |
| 8 | General | To fully understand how the PWS, deliverables and payments (i.e., CLINs set up as LOTs, MONTHs, EA, etc., including SLINs that are set as NSP) will be mapped to Schedule B, can the Government please provide a draft version of Schedule B for review and comment? | The Schedule of Deliverables, Section B will be provided at RTEP posting. |
| 9 | General | For pricing and planning purposes, please clarify any project level dependencies that may impact the scope or schedule of the solution delivery like mandatory milestone dates, external resources (internal or other contractors), or dependent application milestone schedules. | NA. This is a self-contained project. |
| 10 | General | Is there an incumbent contractor? Will the government consider including a transition-in period to allow for knowledge transfer between the Government (or incumbent contractor) and new contractor? | There is no incumbent. This is a new project. |
| 11 | PWS 2.0 | The PWS states that the Contractor must comply with Carnegie Mellon Software Engineering Institute, Capability Maturity Model® Integration for Development (CMMI-DEV), Version 1.3 November 2010; and Carnegie Mellon Software Engineering Institute, Capability Maturity Model® Integration for Acquisition (CMMI-ACQ), Version 1.3 November 2010. For planning and scoping please clarify whether this project is required to perform at a certain CMMI level. | NA. This is an infrastructure project, not a consumer-facing application. |
| 12 | PWS 5.0 | For planning purpose, please clarify what VIP Critical Decision Stage is this program at this point? | Initiation. |
| 13 | PWS 5.1.2 | For planning purposes: Are requirements, code, test plans, test results, and other pertinent VIP required documentation prepared so far in the Rational tool? | No. |
| 14 | PWS 1.0 | The background section states “VA Adaptive Maintenance project will surface specific  VistA/CPRS clinical function and business logic, and emulate with an industry-standard,  model-driven, secure service interface with no legacy MUMPS code dependencies while  keeping CPRS operational (supporting both backwards and forwards compatibility).” Please  clarify what development language satisfies the requirement for “an industry-standard,  model-driven interface”. Specifically, would MUMPS/Cache be considered as long as the  MUMPS code does not reside in Legacy VistA? | No. This creates a MUMPS code dependency. The final solution must be **completely** MUMPS-independent.  This question conflates modelling language with development language. These are two separate things. The choice of modelling language is up to the vendor. The development language as specified in the PWS, must be installable via NPM and run on Node.js. |
| 15 | PWS 3.0 | The scope requires “The Contractor shall provide services including manage, plan, develop,  design, integrate, test, and deploy patches that provide the adaptive maintenance required  for the selected VistA components such that the net result provides both backwards- and  forwards-compatibility with other VistA and commercial products.” Please clarify. Although  the requirement clearly states “no legacy MUMPS dependencies”, will VistA patches be  required for implementation? | Yes. At least one patch will be required to ensure backwards-compatibility with the legacy MUMPS system. |
| 16 | PWS 3.0 | Will the vendor be responsible for modifications to CPRS to implement VICS? | Modifications to CPRS code is expressly forbidden. This is production code that cannot be changed without putting at risk services to veteran care. As stated in the PWS, the solution must be backward-compatible - which means that CPRS continues to run without changes. |
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