

W6369-240393 DATA MIGRATION

AMENDMENT 001

Amendment No. 001 is being issued to address the following:

A) Publish Questions and Answers submitted during the publication.

Question Number	Question	Answer
001 021 022	<p>On page 4 of the solicitation documents referring to the submission of bids, it states to refer to page 1 of the solicitation documents regarding the date, time and place. Unfortunately, the document that is posted on Canada Buys is missing page 1 (this also includes the French version). I am assuming that the Table of Contents is not the intended page 1 for this solicitation.</p> <p>Can we get page 1?</p>	<p>Page one is not missing from the solicitation, the reference is incorrect. The wording will be updated in a future amendment.</p> <p>The posting closes 02 April 2024 at 14:00 EDT.</p> <p>Submissions are to be sent to "desproc2-4-dose2-4@forces.gc.ca".</p>
002 003 004	<p>Vendor requests to be added to the vendor's list for solicitation W6369-240393.</p>	<p>There is no limited or pre-qualified vendor list for this requirement and it is open to all vendors to submit proposals. All vendors with access to CanadaBuys may download the RFP documents.</p>
005	<p>We recognize that DND is seeking a partner to assess its current EHR production environment data and create a detailed plan for archiving, disposing or migrating the data to a new EHR when a future EHR is procured. To that end, can you please confirm that the proponent selected to do this work will not be precluded from participating in the implementation of the new EHR or other EHR related procurements?</p>	<p>Potential bidders MAY be excluded from future EHR procurements if, as part of their work under this solicitation, they have access to information related to future bid solicitations that is not available to other bidders such that, in Canada's opinion, they were given, or appeared to be given, an unfair advantage. This would be determined on a case by case basis and according to any conflict of interest—unfair advantage terms and conditions that may be included in future requirements.</p>

<p>006</p>	<p>Will the winner of this pursuit be excluded from bidding on the actual EHRP project?</p>	<p>Potential bidders MAY be excluded from future EHR procurements if, as part of their work under this solicitation, they have access to information related to future bid solicitations that is not available to other bidders such that, in Canada’s opinion, they were given, or appeared to be given, an unfair advantage. This would be determined on a case by case basis and according to any conflict of interest—unfair advantage terms and conditions that may be included in future requirements.</p>
<p>007</p>	<p>The link provided leads to an archived web site that redirects to Ariba with no clear model describing bid evaluation. Please confirm the evaluation method (i.e. lowest price).</p>	<p>The link in Section 4.3.1 to clause A0220T has been confirmed as correct and accessible. Evaluation method is addressed in Section 4.4.1, A0031T (2010-08-16), Basis of Selection – Mandatory Technical Criteria.</p>
<p>008</p>	<p>Is this a 100% price rated bid?</p>	<p>Evaluation method is addressed in Section 4.4.1, A0031T (2010-08-16), Basis of Selection – Mandatory Technical Criteria:</p> <p>A bid must comply with the requirements of the bid solicitation and meet all mandatory technical evaluation criteria to be declared responsive. The responsive bid with the lowest evaluated price will be recommended for award of a contract.</p>

<p>009</p>	<p>Clause (c) indicates “if the contractor and Canada agree” – this contradicts the preamble of 7.5 that states “if Canada determines, at its sole discretion.”</p>	<p>The wording will be updated to the following in a future amendment:</p> <p>7.5 Right of Pivot</p> <p>During the Initial Contract Period (defined at 7.4.1), if</p> <p>a) Canada determines, at its sole discretion, that the Contractor:</p> <p>i. at any time does not meet the requirement of the contract, or</p> <p>b) the Contractor and Canada agree;</p> <p>then Canada may terminate the Contract and award a new Contract to the next highest ranked responsive Bidder. The next highest ranked responsive Bidder refers to the next Bidder with the next lowest evaluated price in accordance with Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection in solicitation number W6369-240393.</p>
<p>010</p>	<p>In Annex A - Statement of Work - Section 4, on page 33, it is stated that "The Contractor must provide the following deliverables in either Microsoft PowerPoint or Microsoft Word format" given the nature of this work it is expected that the most effective means of communication for some deliverables would be Microsoft Excel, would this be acceptable?</p>	<p>It is acceptable for a portion of the deliverables to be in Microsoft Excel format.</p>
<p>011</p>	<p>In Part 1, Section 1.2, on page 3 we noted that the completion date for this work is targeted for July 31. Could you please clarify if there is any flexibility with this deadline? Additionally, could you confirm the planned start date for this project?</p>	<p>The start date will be on contract award. There is flexibility on the targeted completion date.</p>

<p>012</p>	<p>Section 3.1 on page 7 specifies that submissions must fit into 1 transmission. However, both Section 3.1, Item #2 on page 7, and Section 2.2 on page 4 indicate that submissions can be sent in multiple emails. Could you please clarify the submission guidelines?</p>	<p>A future amendment will correct the first paragraph.</p> <p>3.1 Bid Preparation Instructions, first para</p> <p>Canada requests that the Bidder submits its bid electronically in accordance with section 8 of the 2003 standard instructions and as amended in Part 2 - Bidder Instructions, Article 2.1 Standard Instructions, Clauses and Conditions. The total size any email, including all attachments, must not exceed 10 megabytes (MB). It is solely the Bidder's responsibility to ensure that the total size any email does not exceed this limit.</p>
<p>013</p>	<p>In Section 3.3 on page 31, there are references made to Section 0 and Section 0. Could you please clarify if this is a typo, and if so, provide the correct section references?</p>	<p>A future amendment will correct the missing references.</p> <p>3.3 Phase 3 – Data Migration Implementation Plan</p> <p>In this final phase of the requirement, the contractor must provide a detailed technical description of the steps required to move data from the CFHIS data storage to a new EHR's data storage. As well, the contractor must specify the ancillary data governance activities required specific to the data migration activity as per Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 of this SOW.</p>
<p>014</p>	<p>In Section 3.1.1 on page 29, there is a general reference to content being located in the Appendix without specifying a particular figure. Based on the context, it seems this may refer to the unlabeled content on page 37. Could you please confirm if this is the case or provide the specific figure or section in the Appendix that is being referenced?</p>	<p>The reference in SOW Section 3.1.1 is to "Appendix – United States Core Data for Interoperability Draft Version 4" and includes all content from page 36 to 39.</p>

<p>015</p>	<p>"Is the successful bidder expected to perform Data Quality Assessment and other tasks in DND's current environment? a. If yes, does DND have specific master data management and data quality assessment tools deployed in their environment, and a strong preference for these to be utilized by the vendor for the Data Quality Assessment?"</p>	<p>The successful bidder is expected to perform Data Quality Assessment (Section 3.1.2 of the SOW) and other tasks through access to DND subject matter experts and access to representative subsets of the data contained in the production environment. If there is a need for more access to complete the tasks, DND will provide access accordingly. DND does not have specific data management and data quality assessment tools.</p>
<p>016</p>	<p>"Are there existing Data Governance framework, policies, procedures and controls at DND? a. Do these include data classification standards and are these standards already applied to the in-scope data contained in the CFHIS production environment?"</p>	<p>DND does not have a robust existing data governance framework for health-related data. There are no data classification standards other than those that are incorporated by the vendors of the COTS products that form the core of the CFHIS system.</p>
<p>017</p>	<p>Page 7 of the RFP states "Unless specified otherwise in the RFP, bids must be received by the Contract Authority at the location identified by the date, time and place indicated on page 1 of the solicitation". We are unable to find this information in the RFP document. Can you please provide? Or confirm it is "desproc2-4-dose2-4@forces.gc.ca" April 2, 2024 at 2 PM Eastern?</p>	<p>Page one is not missing from the solicitation, the reference is incorrect. The wording will be updated in a future amendment.</p> <p>The posting closes 02 April 2024 at 14:00 EDT.</p> <p>Submissions are to be sent to "desproc2-4-dose2-4@forces.gc.ca".</p>
<p>018</p>	<p>Could you please confirm whether a team-based strategy, utilizing the combined client engagement experiences and expertise of several SMEs to collectively satisfy each mandatory requirement, is permissible for this bid?</p>	<p>Evaluation criteria M1 through M5 will be modified when evaluating all bid responses.</p> <p>All subject matter experts working on each requirement have performed the work specified in Sections 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.2, 3.3.1, and 3.3.2 of the Statement of Work; the words "... all their..." will be replaced by the words "... at least one of their..." in each criterion specified in the "Mandatory Criteria" column of the table. Similarly, the words "... SMEs have ..." will be replaced with the words "... SME(s) has/had..." in the Bid Preparation Instructions column of the table.</p>

<p>019</p>	<p>Considering the requirement for Electronic Health Record (EHR) expertise within mandates M2, M3, and M4, we suggest appointing a specialized EHR Subject Matter Expert (SME) to guide and assist across these key areas. In light of this, we propose the elimination of the EHR experience condition from mandates M2, M3, and M4, thus enabling the identification and selection of the most apt resources based on their primary skills rather than specific EHR knowledge. This approach aims to harness the optimal mix of expert capabilities for the project, promoting a targeted and efficient application of specialized knowledge.</p> <p>Could this approach, involving the designation of a singular EHR SME while removing the EHR-specific experience criteria from the mentioned mandates, be considered acceptable for this bid?</p>	<p>No, the requirement for SMEs to have EHR experience will not be eliminated from the mandatory criteria M2, M3, and M4.</p>
-------------------	--	---

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED