

## Questions received: P26001916, 03/13/2026    Answers posted: 03/20/2026

No.	Question	Answer								
1	Will you be issuing an Excel version of Attachment 1-Functional Specifications ?	See Amendment on 03/16/2026, Attachment G.								
2	The document states the proposal number is RFP-26-003-02, but here in HlePRO, it shows that it is P26001916. Which should we use in our response documents?	Offerors should reference RFP-26-003-02 in proposal documents. The HlePRO number P26001916 is the system tracking number.								
3	Is Attachment ! - Functional Specifications available in excel?	See Amendment on 03/16/2026, Attachment G.								
4	Does DOH have an existing payment system that could be integrated with the Vital Records System?	No, DOH expects the Offerer to propose a new ordering and payment system.								
5	What volume of data needs to be migrated from the legacy system?	<p>The primary legacy system is the Vital Statistics System (VSS). Current production data is approximately 30 GB of structured Oracle data, representing records across births, deaths, and marriages. Final volume will be validated during discovery. Paper records are excluded from migration at this time, however, digitization of paper records is anticipated in the future.</p> <p>The number of vital records in the VSS system:</p> <table style="margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td>Birth</td> <td>1,828,797</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Death</td> <td>720,391</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Marriage</u></td> <td><u>1,351,202</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total:</td> <td>3,900,390</td> </tr> </table>	Birth	1,828,797	Death	720,391	<u>Marriage</u>	<u>1,351,202</u>	Total:	3,900,390
Birth	1,828,797									
Death	720,391									
<u>Marriage</u>	<u>1,351,202</u>									
Total:	3,900,390									
6	Are there existing document annotations (redactions, stamps, etc.) or versions that need to be migrated from the legacy systems?	No.								
7	Are there existing metadata/index fields that need to be migrated? If so, many would need to be migrated?	Yes. See examples of such data fields are included in the worksheets (Birth, Marriage, Civil Union and Death), see Amendment dated 03/20/2026.								
8	How many security roles would need to be configured?	Based on existing workflows across Registration, Issuance, Corrections, Statistics, Accounting, Supervisors, External Users (e.g., hospitals, mortuaries), and System Administration, we anticipate approximately 15–25 distinct security roles. Final role definitions and counts will be confirmed by OHSM.								
9	For electronic communication with Community Stakeholders and/or Customers, do you need users authenticated or is communication via API acceptable?	Yes. Authenticated access is required for internal users and community stakeholders (such as hospitals, mortuaries, and physicians) who submit or access records. Non user-system to system communication (such as data exchanges, notifications, or reporting) is acceptable without user login, as long as it is secured appropriately.								

## Questions received: P26001916, 03/13/2026    Answers posted: 03/20/2026

No.	Question	Answer
10	The Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM), which is RFP Attachment G, appears within the PDF version of the solicitation, starting on the 95th page of the PDF. However, instructions on the 94th page explain this attachment be completed as an Excel file with drop-down boxes. Also, some of the instructions are cut off within the PDF. Please provide immediately the Excel document so we may begin working on it.	See Amendment on 03/16/2026, Attachment G.
11	Would the state consider responses from Vendors to provide only the Remote Identity Proofing / Verification services for online ordering of Vital Records?	No. OHSM is seeking a comprehensive Vital Records System solution as described in the RFP.
12	The RFP requires proposals submissions in hard copy and electronically through HlePRO. To promote conservation of resources, would the State consider omitting the requirement for printed hard copies and allowing online submissions through HlePRO only?	No. Offerors must comply with the proposal submission requirements outlined in the RFP unless modified by amendment.
13	RFP Section 3.1(K) requests on-site training. What is the anticipated duration for on-site training? Also, how many separate trips or sessions are expected?	DOH anticipates multiple on site training sessions over several days, potentially 2–4 weeks total, delivered in phases by role (e.g., Registration, Issuance, Statistics, external users).
14	RFP Section 2.1(D) say offshore resources are allowed pursuant to OHSM's written approval. What is the process for requesting authorization for offshore resources for development and/or QA? Is this a post-contract formality, and can we make assumptions within the RFP response that offshore resources may be utilized?	Identify the use of any potential offshore resources in the proposal, how they will be used and what percentage of staff they comprise. OHSM will notify Offeror if approved. If not approved by OHSM, the Offeror should identify alternatives. No, this is not a post-contract formality.

## Questions received: P26001916, 03/13/2026 Answers posted: 03/20/2026

No.	Question	Answer
15	The State's answers to Offerors' questions may significantly impact our approach to various sections of our proposal. Given the timing of the State's answers to Offerors' questions as reflected in RFP Section 1.1 Procurement Timetable, would the State consider a proposal deadline extension?	No, the proposal due date remains as stated in the RFP Procurement Timetable.
16	Pursuant to RFP Section 3.1(M) "Go-Live Stabilization," in lieu of a proposal's providing the actual plan documents, please confirm that a narrative around the project management overview/approach to each of the requirement plans will suffice.	Yes. Offerors may provide a narrative description of their proposed project management approach and methodology for developing the required plans. The narrative should demonstrate the Offeror's proposed governance, processes, and controls for plan development. Detailed plan documents will be developed and submitted for State review and approval during the implementation phase in accordance with the RFP requirements.
17	RFP Section 3.1(K) provides training requirements. Please confirm that the Offer shall provide training to OHSM staff only, rather than to ancillary users such as medical examiners, funeral directors, etc.	No, training for external stakeholders (e.g., medical examiners, funeral directors, and other ancillary users) is required.
18	RFP Section 3.1(D)(3) refers to integration tools such as Scribe and Azure Data Factory. Are these tools mandatory for the implementation, or simply illustrative examples of acceptable integration platforms? If they are examples, will the State accept alternative integration platforms or built-in capabilities provided by the Offeror's proposed system?	The integration tools referenced in the RFP (e.g., Scribe and Azure Data Factory) are provided as illustrative examples of acceptable integration platforms. Offerors may propose alternative integration platforms or built-in integration capabilities within their proposed solution, provided the approach meets the integration, interoperability, security, and performance requirements outlined in the RFP.
19	How many records are expected to be converted for each module? Additionally please provide: the source system for each dataset, and the starting date of the records for each module.	See answer to question #5.

## Questions received: P26001916, 03/13/2026 Answers posted: 03/20/2026

No.	Question	Answer
20	RFP Section 3.1(H)(1) says, “The Offeror is expected to collaborate with the legacy system vendors to the extent possible to ensure data migration success and incremental legacy system decommissioning.” Please clarify what is meant by legacy system vendors. Please also provide: the names of the vendors, the associated legacy systems, and the expected level of collaboration with those vendors during the data migration process.	The legacy vendor information is provided in Section 2.1 second paragraph below Table II-4 of the RFP.
21	The RFP indicates that data conversion will be completed by July 15, 2026. Please confirm whether this milestone applies only to the data items associated with the Core Module, excluding any state-required fields.	No, COTS module(s) and license(s) should be purchased and invoiced no later than July 15, 2026.
22	Please confirm whether the State is open to a vendor-hosted solution where the Offeror hosts and manages the system and data.	Yes.
23	For the July 2026 delivery milestone, does the State define success as the delivery of any one (1) module from Table II-6 on RFP page 33?	No, please see the paragraph prior to Table II-6 in Section 2.1.E.1 .

## Questions received: P26001916, 03/13/2026    Answers posted: 03/20/2026

No.	Question	Answer
24	RFP Section 2.1(E)(1) says, "OHSM shall require from the Offeror delivery of any combination of the following Modules by July 15, 2026. The modules are Core, Birth, Death, Marriage, and an On-line Ordering Module." Table III-1 defines the July 15, 2026 deliverables as Module Licenses for Core, Birth, Marriage and Death and an On-line Ordering Module. Please provide additional detail on what must be delivered by July 15, 2026. Specifically, are contractual licenses for each module in combination with establishment of OHSM specific environments considered a successful deliverable, or is a UI/UX Wireframe for each module required as part of the initial deliverable?	No, see answer to question #21.
25	Please confirm that the State is open to collaborating with the vendor to determine the recommended implementation timeline and sequencing for each phase.	Yes, provided the July 15 deadlines have been met. See answer to question #21.
26	2.1.E.1 / Table II-6 / 3.1.A (Page 31-32, 38) states the Offeror shall provide modules that can be "delivered immediately upon contract award," with the contract start date estimated at May 4-29, 2026 and invoice submission required by July 15, 2026. Can OHSM confirm that "delivery" of these Initial Deliverables (Core, Birth, Death, Marriage, and/or Online Ordering modules) refers to the delivery of base platform licenses and unconfigured module access, and that full configuration, Hawaii-specific setup, testing, and go-live activities occur during the subsequent "Customization, Planning, and Requirements, Design, & Training Implementation" phase (August 2026 – June 2027)?	Yes. See answer to question #21.

## Questions received: P26001916, 03/13/2026    Answers posted: 03/20/2026

No.	Question	Answer
27	Section 2.1.E.1 / Table II-6 (Page 31-31) identifies Phase I Go-Live (July 2027) and Phase II Go-Live (July 2028) but does not specify which modules are expected to be operational at each go-live milestone. Does OHSM have a preference or expectation for which modules should be included in Phase I Go-Live versus Phase II Go-Live, or is this entirely at the Offeror's discretion to propose?	Yes, provided the July 15 deadlines have been met. See answer to question #21.
28	Section 3.1.A / Table III-1 (Page 38): In Table III-1, Section 3.1.A lists the Initial Deliverables as "Core Module License," "Birth Module License," "Marriage Module License," "Death Module License," and "On-line Ordering Module, and/or." Please clarify the meaning of the "and/or" qualifier on the Online Ordering Module. Is online ordering a mandatory component of the initial delivery, an optional module that OHSM may elect not to select, or contingent on another factor? Should Offerors include it in their initial delivery pricing, or present it as a separately selectable option?	Offerors should include all Modules in their initial delivery pricing. "And/or" refers to OHSM's decision and ability to purchase based on available funds.
29	4.9 / Attachment F (OF-2) (Page 70): Attachment F requires pricing per module broken into License, Configuration, Implementation, and Maintenance & Operations. For Offerors providing a cloud-hosted SaaS solution with recurring subscription-based pricing rather than perpetual licenses, should annual or monthly subscription fees be entered under the "License" line, the "Maintenance & Operations" line, or split across both? Can OHSM provide guidance on how SaaS subscription pricing should map to the OF-2 cost structure?	For a SaaS model, initial costs for modules for year one (1) may be recorded on the License line for each respective module in Part I. Recurring subscription fees for continued use would be captured under Maintenance & Operations in Part II.

## Questions received: P26001916, 03/13/2026 Answers posted: 03/20/2026

No.	Question	Answer
30	Section 2.1.A/3.1.H (Page 24 and Page 52): Section 2.1.A describes the current system as "a combination of five (5) separate systems." Can OHSM identify these five systems, including the technology platform and database type for each, the vendor currently supporting each system, and the approximate volume of records per event type (birth, death, marriage, fetal death, divorce) and associated document images to be migrated? This information is needed to accurately scope the data migration effort and pricing.	Yes, see answer to question #5.
31	Section 2.1.E (Page 31): Section 2.1.E states that "preference will be given to a proposed portal solution built within a DOH-owned and managed cloud environment." Can OHSM clarify whether this means the VRS must be deployed within a DOH-managed Azure tenant? If so, will OHSM provide the Azure subscription and tenant access, or is the Offeror expected to procure and manage the cloud environment? What infrastructure, if any, is currently provisioned and available within the DOH cloud environment for this project?	See Amendment 3 dated 03/20/2026.

## Questions received: P26001916, 03/13/2026 Answers posted: 03/20/2026

No.	Question	Answer
32	<p>Section 3.1.D.4 / 3.3 (Page 44 and Page 60): Section 3.1.D.4 states "The Offeror must agree to provide the State with the source code for all modifications and any custom development." For Offerors proposing a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) SaaS solution, jurisdictional requirements are typically met through platform configuration rather than custom source code modifications, and such configurations become part of the vendor's core product. Can OHSM confirm that a source code escrow arrangement for the underlying COTS platform is acceptable in lieu of direct source code delivery of the base product?</p>	<p>Source code is only required for custom code written for OHSM. An escrow arrangement is acceptable for any custom code created for OHSM, but is not needed for any COTS base code.</p>
33	<p>Section 2.1.E (Page 31): Section 2.1.E references a desire for "an appointment/scheduling system to accommodate setting and changing appointments for obtaining certificates in person and marriage licenses," qualified with "if possible." Is this appointment/scheduling capability a scored requirement, a desired but optional feature, or informational only? Should Offerors include pricing for this capability in the OF-2, or should it be presented as a separately priced optional item?</p>	<p>Since the capability is optional, it is not a scored requirement. The appointment/scheduling capability is considered a desired optional feature. While a specific line item is not provided, Offerors may insert additional lines for essential functionality if Offerors solution includes this feature.</p>
34	<p>Section 3.1.D.3 (Page 44): Section 3.1.D.3 references optimizing the new data model for "generative artificial intelligence." Can OHSM describe the anticipated use cases for generative AI within the VRS? Are there existing State of Hawaii policies or restrictions governing the use of AI technologies with vital records data that Offerors should be aware of when developing their proposed approach?</p>	<p>See Amendment 5 dated 03/20/2026.</p>

## Questions received: P26001916, 03/13/2026    Answers posted: 03/20/2026

No.	Question	Answer
35	Section 2.1.A (Page 24): Section 2.1.A states OHSM is "moving toward eliminating maintaining divorce records and generating divorce certificates since these records are available through the court" and projects zero divorce orders in FY 2027. Can OHSM confirm the current status of this initiative? Should the proposed VRS exclude divorce record functionality entirely, or should Offerors include it as part of the solution?	OHSM has eliminated divorce records, therefore, divorce record functionality is excluded.
36	Section 2.1.E / 3.1.F.1 (Page 31 and Page 50): The RFP includes an Online Ordering Module and references payment processing, identity/eligibility verification, and certificate issuance. Can OHSM clarify whether the online ordering capability must directly process payments (including refunds, voids, and receipt generation) through a vendor-provided payment gateway, or whether integration to a separate State-selected PCI-compliant payment processing platform is required or preferred?	The solution must include secure integrations with PCI-compliant payment gateways and support functionalities such as refunds, voids and receipt generation.
37	Section 1.21 / Attachments J, K (Page 17) Section 1.21 states that submitting a proposal constitutes agreement to the General Conditions (Attachment J) and Special Conditions (Attachment K), and that the State has no obligation to accept varying terms. If an Offeror identifies provisions in these attachments that require clarification or narrowly tailored modification to accommodate a COTS SaaS delivery model, should those be submitted solely through this written question process? Will the State consider publishing acceptable alternative language through addendum?	While the state is not obligated to accept varying terms, any proposed modifications should be submitted as an "Exceptions to the General and/or Special Conditions" statement within your proposal packet.

## Questions received: P26001916, 03/13/2026    Answers posted: 03/20/2026

No.	Question	Answer
38	<p>Section 2.1.D / 1.25.E (Page 31, 18): Section 2.1.D states the Offeror is not required to maintain a physical staff presence in Hawaii but that OHSM may elect to have in-person meetings as it deems necessary. Section 1.25.E states no payments will be made for travel-related expenses. To accurately include travel costs in our pricing, can OHSM provide its expectations for on-site versus remote delivery across key project phases (discovery, design, training, testing, go-live, and stabilization), and identify any mandatory in-person events or an estimated number of on-site trips anticipated over the project lifecycle?</p>	<p>There will be 3 to 4 distinct periods (Discovery, Design, Training) of onsite presence for which the number of FTEs will vary. See answer to question #13.</p>
39	<p>Section 1.8.H (Page 10-11): Section 1.8.H requires physical delivery of hard copy proposals (one unbound original and five bound copies each for Technical and Cost Proposals) to OHSM at 1250 Punchbowl Street, Honolulu, HI 96813 by 2:00 p.m. HST on April 2, 2026. Given shipping lead times to Hawaii, must hard copies be physically received by the same date and time as the electronic HlePRO submission, or will OHSM accept hard copies within a reasonable number of business days following the electronic submission deadline?</p>	<p>No. See answer to question #12.</p>

## Questions received: P26001916, 03/13/2026    Answers posted: 03/20/2026

No.	Question	Answer
40	Section 5.2 / Attachment G (Page 73-74): The Attachment G instructions state that items marked with an asterisk (*) are subject to a Pass/Fail assessment. If an Offeror responds "NA" (Not Available) to an RTM requirement that is not marked with an asterisk, will this result in a "Fail" determination for the RTM overall, or are non-mandatory items evaluated separately under the Technical Solution scoring criteria?	"If an Offeror responds "NA" (Not Available) to an RTM requirement that is not marked with an asterisk, will this result in a "Fail" determination for the RTM overall," No. "or are non-mandatory items evaluated separately under the Technical Solution scoring criteria?" No.
41	Section 1.8.H / 1.10 (Page 10-11, 14): Section 1.8.H requires one electronic version of the Technical Proposal and one electronic version of the Cost Proposal to be submitted through HlePRO. Section 1.10 notes a maximum file size of 100MB per file. Can OHSM confirm the required electronic file format (e.g., searchable PDF, Microsoft Word, or both), and whether each proposal part should be submitted as a single consolidated file or may be submitted as multiple files organized by section?	Provide the technical and cost proposals separately, in both Word and PDF documents. Divide the files into segments of up to 100 MB each.
42	Section 1.8H (Page 10-11): Section 1.8.H states the authorized signature on the Offer Form (OF-1) "shall be an original signature in ink" and that proposals with a facsimile or photocopy signature will be rejected. Does this original ink signature requirement apply only to the one (1) unbound original of the Technical Proposal, or must all five (5) bound copies also bear original ink signatures?	See Amendment 1 dated 03/20/2026.

## Questions received: P26001916, 03/13/2026    Answers posted: 03/20/2026

No.	Question	Answer
43	<p>Section 1.8 H, page 12 - Proposal Submittal: In paragraph two the RFP notes that all proposals should be uploaded to HlePRO and also mail physical copies. We would like to confirm that the State does, in fact, want physical copies of the proposals shipped versus simply submitting a digital copy?</p>	See answer to question #12.
44	<p>Section 2.2 B, page 35 - Firm Qualifications: This section notes that bidders should provide two (2) references. Yet in 4.12 and on the Reference Form it indicates three (3) references. Which is the correct total number of references that bidders should provide?</p>	Provide at least two (2) references but more references may be supplied.
45	<p>Section 2.2 C, page 36 - In 2.1 E (1) DOH states that they “intend to select... and out-of-the box VRS solution,’ that “should be configurable and limit custom development.”</p> <p>In 2.2 C, the State is requiring 6 full time positions. A modern, COTS VRS platform that meets the expectations of 2.1 E should not require this many full-time staff to successfully implement HI’s platform and meet its requirements.</p> <p>We would request that bidders be allowed to propose the necessary number of staff believed to be required to meet the needs of DOH and provide a narrative that supports why the number of staff proposed is sufficient to complete a successful project.</p>	See Amendment 4 dated 03/20/2026.

## Questions received: P26001916, 03/13/2026 Answers posted: 03/20/2026

No.	Question	Answer
46	Section 2.2 C, page 37 - Table II-7: If a bidder is proposing hosting with it's own HIPAA compliant cloud service provider, are we allowed to eliminate this position?	Yes. See answer to question #45.
47	Attachment G - System, 11.2.8 - The system may create and apply to certificates digital and/or automated certification and embossing. Is the state looking to have printers digitally emboss the certificate or print on paper that is already embossed?	OHSM will explore digital solutions at a future date.
48	Attachment G – Architecture – 1.5, page 109- 1.5 The system may include a lookup function into other databases to assist with day-to-day activities (e.g.; Corrections sealed documents, Genealogy queries) What databases or how many databases is State looking to connect with this read only look up.	Birth, Marriage, and Death record solutions, if separated, should all be connected to the Core module.
49	Attachment G – Architecture 1.15, page 110 - The system may be AI-ready, scalable, and compliant with modern data standards. What is the state considering as AI-ready? Is there certain functionality or integration points that you are specifically looking for?	See Amendment 5 dated 03/20/2026.
50	General question: How many data formats does the current data reside in?	See RFP Section 2.1, the paragraph below Table II-4.
51	General question: How many different formats are expected to be migrated to the new system?	All data contained in Birth, Marriage, and Death records to be migrated are currently contained in Oracle databases.
52	Attachment 1-Functional Specifications in Ref. 11.3.9 it asks for an integration to LT Governor's site for Apostille application and payment. Would the issuance still occur within the new application?	Yes, issuance will still occur in the new application.

## Questions received: P26001916, 03/13/2026    Answers posted: 03/20/2026

No.	Question	Answer
53	Page 32 of the RFP mentions for an interface with a Document Management System. In Attachment 1-Technical Specifications, Ref 5.9.6 the requirement sounds like the desire is for document management to be handled by the proposed system. Can you clarify as to what the preference of the State is in this regard; does the State want a new document management system or for simply a connection to the current document management system?	The State requires the proposed solution to include its own document management functionality for ingesting, storing and retrieving records. The solution must also provide the repository architecture and an integrated viewer with redaction controls.
54	Could the State comment on their preferred cloud solution provider and platform for this VRS solution?	See answer to question #31.
55	The RFP states the Offeror must have an existing system that includes all required modules. Can the State confirm whether they are open to an offeror to build these modules post analysis and design phase, leveraging a modern cloud-based platform, tailoring the solution for the VRS requirements? Please confirm if the offeror will be disqualified from submitting a response if the modules are not pre-built.	No, OHSM is not open to an Offeror building modules post analysis. See RFP Section 2.1.E.1, paragraph 2.
56	For the required VRS references. Please confirm if these must be existing VRS solutions, or can an offeror include references for other large Health and Human Services and Government Services agencies where solutions were built using a modern cloud-based platform?	See RFP Section 2.2.B Firm Qualifications.
57	For the 3-years minimum experience. Please confirm if this experience must be for VRS solutions or can an offeror include experience from other large HHS and Government services agencies where solutions were build using a modern cloud-based platform?	See answer to question #56.

## Questions received: P26001916, 03/13/2026 Answers posted: 03/20/2026

No.	Question	Answer
58	Could the State confirm whether migration responsibilities include associated electronic artifacts—such as scanned documents, images, and attachments—linked to legacy records, or whether any portion of document migration will be performed separately by the State?	No, there are currently no documents to be migrated.
59	What is the total size in GB of all existing documents that need to be migrated to the new system?	See answer to #58.
60	How many total files need to be migrated?	See answer to question #5.
61	What is the projected annual increase of new files count and growth of new GB per year? How many paper documents will require automated intake each year?	There are no more than 60,000 new birth, death, and marriage records submitted annually, in electronic format.
62	What is the desired future state security model? Which groups/roles of people will have access to which types of content?	See answer to question #8.
63	What metadata is tracked for each document type?	See answer to question #7.
64	How do users search for documents? What metadata would they want to filter search results by?	See answer to question #7.
65	Aside from the list of vital records certificates, what other types of supporting documentation must be stored (e.g. related to requests, orders, payments, invoices, etc.).	Examples include but are not limited to: Court orders, Power of Attorney, Trust documents, IDs, VEPs, Affidavits, Certified Name Changes, Permits.
66	Can the State provide a retention schedule for all types of documents?	See Amendment dated 03/20/2026.
67	Can the State identify a few areas of content that must be encrypted or are subject to complex security scenarios, such as: printing or downloading not allowed, sharing over live sessions not allowed, etc.?	Data should be encrypted in transit and at rest for protecting sensitive information from unauthorized access, breaches, and cyber threats.