TECHNICAL EVALUATION FORM – FIRM FIXED PRICE

Solicitation Number T4NG-0739	Task Title VistA Application Analytics	
Name of Offeror Offeror B		Date of Proposal

1. Technical Evaluation Criteria: TECHNICAL: The evaluation of the Request for Proposal (RFP) considered the following:	**Technical Rating:** Unacceptable

1. Technical Evaluation Criteria:

TECHNICAL: The evaluation of the Request for Proposal (RFP) considered the following:

(1) Understanding of the Problem – The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which it demonstrates a clear understanding of all features involved in solving the problems and meeting and/or exceeding the requirements presented in the solicitation and the extent to which uncertainties are identified and resolutions proposed.

(2) Feasibility of Approach – The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the proposed approach is workable and the end results achievable. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the level of confidence provided the Government with respect to the Offeror's methods and approach in successfully meeting and/or exceeding the requirements in a timely manner.

2. Proposal Summary:

Offeror provided a technical approach for the capture of RPC traffic from three VistA systems . They will capture of the RPC traffic using Kinesis, store the traffic using Simple Storage Service (S3), and provide monitoring of the traffic using Cloudwatch. Offeror addressed only this first task (5.2.1) called for in the PWS. For the remainder of the tasks (5.2.2 through 5.3.2) the Offeror was nonresponsive.

Offeror A has proposed to team with no subcontractor.

After review of the entire technical volume, it was determined that the Offeror's approach contained *Deficiencies*.

3. Summary of Significant Strengths: None identified

4. Summary of Strengths: None identified

5. Summary of Significant Weaknesses: See Deficiencies

6. Summary of Weaknesses: See Deficiencies

7. Summary of Deficiencies:

Overview: The following details the non-responsiveness of the offeror's response for three of the four base year TEPs and for the two optional year TEPs required by the Vista Application Analytics PWS. The overall impression of their response is that the offeror believes that broad claims of capability to analyze in general should suffice and that the specific requirements of the PWS to analyze RPC traffic need not be addressed.

Deficiency #1 - TEP 5.2.2 requires very specific analysis (requirements a-h) of the RPC traffic of three cloud-resident VistAs captured during task 5.2.1. Offeror doesn't address any of these very specific requirements beyond re-stating them (page 9) and committing to address them. Instead, they make a broad promise to use some of the "cloud native tools for performing advanced analytics" and a "best-in-class machine learning or descriptive analytics engine", state their willingness to "provide an analysis of alternatives," and list their "deep experience with these advanced analytics tools" and developing "visualization." Finally, they say "our Technical Writer will create four separate reports, supported by our Data Scientists and VistA SMEs" and follow this with a claim that these reports will address the requirements, which they go on to re-state. These claims of broad expertise in analysis in general, of a willingness to use and evaluate common tools and an ability to write reports could be re-stated without change in response to any call for cloud-based analysis. They in no way address the specific requirements of this TEP and display a lack of knowledge about the nature of RPCs in general and the specific RPCs in scope to address the analysis required. This catalog of generic capabilities and unsupported commitments is evaluated "non-responsive" according to the governments evaluation criteria.

Deficiency #2 - TEP 5.2.3 requires very specific analysis (requirements a-m) of the RPC traffic of each of the VA's three main point-of-care clients. The required analysis must measure the traffic in specific ways, categorize all RPCs seen and relate that traffic to user screens to enable recommendations for improvement called for in 5.2.4. Offeror doesn't address any of these very specific requirements beyond re-stating them (2.1.3) and committing to addressing them using a "Technical Writer, in concert with our Data Scientists, VistA SMEs, and Delphi/CPRS SME." They also promise to "work with clinically active VA informaticists." Such generic commitments fail to even outline the specific knowledge and steps required to provide the required, per-client RPC traffic analysis. The offeror fails to demonstrate their knowledge of RPCs in general or how they would match those RPCs to the operation of clients by clinicians, called for in the requirements. Their generic commitments and claims of generally applicable expertise are evaluated "non-responsive" according to the governments evaluation criteria.

Deficiency #3 - TEP 5.2.4 calls for recommendations for improvement of client operation based solely on the results of the analysis for 5.2.3. Offeror states that their "VistA SMEs and Delphi/CRPS SME will leverage the three VistA Client Use Analysis Reports produced in PWS 5.2.3, using the standard template and KPIs." Offeror also proposes (figure 3, 2.1.4) the use of "other domain specific considerations" and "industry standard factors" drawn from unspecified sources of

information. As the offeror's reply to TEP 5.2.3 fails to specify how they would perform the analysis required to produce "Client Use Analysis Reports" or even if they understood what was required, they cannot be expected to deliver recommendations "based solely" on those reports. Introducing analysis of generic "industry standard factors" based on unknown and unspecified sources of information is no substitute for doing the specific analysis required. As a result they cannot be expected to deliver these recommendations in the required manner and this reply is deemed "un-responsive."

Deficiency #4 - TEP 5.3.1 calls for analysis of the VistA of a site already migrated to Cerner using the same approach taken during the base year, where the traffic capture is followed by in-depth analysis. Offeror commits to re-using the capture mechanism and analysis they presume to exist from the base year. Specifically for analysis, they claim (2.1.5) "as established during the Base Year, we will have all the metrics set up for collection and analysis of the data captured." Given that this TEP calls for more of the type of analysis performed in the base year, such commitments would only be credible had Offeror's answers to the base year's basic analysis TEPs (5.2.2, 5.2.3) been responsive. Offeror also claims that work they performed for Oracle Go-lives and cut-overs "will help our team review the data traffic and analysis and know where to look for changes to that traffic." Such expertise is helpful only if the offeror has demonstrated an ability to first perform basic RPC traffic analysis. However, the offeror failed to state with any specificity how they would perform such analysis either in this reply or in the replies to related TEPs from the base year. This absence of detail and the lack of established expertise from responses to base year TEPs make offeror's reply "un-responsive."

Deficiency #5 - TEP 5.3.2 calls for specific analysis of the way VistA and its clients provide for community/private-sector care. To address this TEP, Offeror commits to (2.1.6 p12) "apply this same machine learning or descriptive analytics solution based on the previous determination of the VA stakeholders. We will leverage all lessons learned from the base year around collecting, storing, and analyzing this data." This commitment repeats a broad promise made earlier to apply unspecified "machine learning" and relies on having established an ability to perform in-depth RPC traffic analysis in earlier answers. The offeror goes on to state "team brings extensive experience supporting both business and technical aspects of the VA Community Care Program" and that they "will leverage subject matter experts from that work to help inform our recommendations." Such expertise is relevant only if the offeror has already demonstrated an ability to perform basic RPC traffic analysis. The complete absence of specifics about how they would perform such traffic analysis either in this reply or in the replies to related TEPs from the base year makes this an "un-responsive" reply.

8. Evaluation Criteria:

a. Understanding of the Problem
As evidenced by the deficiencies above, overall the Offeror demonstrates a lack of understanding of the problems.

b. Feasibility of Approach As evidenced by the deficiencies above, overall the Offeror demonstrates an approach that cannot be expected to meet the requirements. **9. Rating: Unacceptable** - A proposal that contains a major error(s), omission(s) or deficiency(ies) that indicates a lack of understanding of the problems or an approach that cannot be expected to meet requirements or involves a very high risk; and none of these conditions can be corrected without a major rewrite or revision of the proposal.	
Evaluator Signature	**Date**