

VistA Application Analytics

T4NG TASK ORDER (TO) EVALUATION PLAN

VistA Application Analytics

A. BASIS FOR AWARD

Any award will be made based on the best overall (i.e., best value) Task Execution Plan (TEP) that is determined to be the most beneficial to the Government, with appropriate consideration given to the three following evaluation Factors: Technical, Price and Past Performance. The Technical Factor is significantly more important than the Price Factor, which is significantly more important than the Past Performance Factor. To receive consideration for award, a rating of no less than "Acceptable" must be achieved for the Technical Factor. The non-Price Factors combined are significantly more important than the Price Factor. Offerors are cautioned that the award may not necessarily be made to the lowest Price offered or the highest rated Technical proposal.

B. FACTORS TO BE EVALUATED

1. TECHNICAL
2. PRICE
3. PAST PERFORMANCE

C. EVALUATION APPROACH – TEPs, which include all volumes, shall be subject to evaluation by a team of Government personnel. The Government reserves the right to award without discussions based upon the initial evaluation of the TEP. The TEP will be evaluated strictly in accordance with its written content. Technical Volumes which merely restate the requirement or state that the requirement will be met, without providing supporting rationale, are not sufficient. TEPs which fail to meet the minimum requirements of the Request for Task Execution Plans (RTEP) will be rated Unacceptable.

1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION APPROACH. The evaluation process will consider the following:

a. Understanding of the Problem - The Technical Volume 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 task and the extent to which uncertainties are identified and resolutions proposed.

VistA Application Analytics

b. Feasibility of Approach - The Technical Volume will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the proposed approach is workable and the end results achievable. The Technical Volume 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. PRICE EVALUATION APPROACH.

☒ Fixed Price:

The Government will evaluate price by adding the total of all line item prices, including all options. The total evaluated price will be that sum.

All prices shall be rounded to the nearest cent. The Government reserves the right to correct any rounding errors identified in the Offeror's TEP.

The Government will verify the Offeror's calculation of the total proposed price. Further, the Government may make adjustments to the evaluated price if mathematical errors are identified.

3. PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION APPROACH

The Past Performance evaluation will be based upon the average of the cumulative Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) Performance Based Service Assessment ratings received for all awarded task orders, the extent to which Small Business Participation goals have been met, and the extent to which the Veterans employment percentage of Veterans employed has been maintained. The Past Performance Factor rating shall be expressed as a numerical score. Offerors may receive a maximum possible score of ten (10) points in past performance, a maximum possible score of five (5) points in past performance in achieving small business participation percentages, and a maximum of five (5) points for maintaining or exceeding Veterans employment percentage of Veterans employed for a total maximum possible score of twenty (20) points. In the case of an Offeror with less than six (6) months of performance history under T4NG, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance.

Offerors are NOT to submit past performance as a part of their TEP.

D. TEP SUBMISSION

TEPs shall be submitted in accordance with the Basic Contract PWS, paragraph 7.3.2. Offerors are permitted to provide ONLY ONE (1) TEP for consideration. TEPs shall be

VistA Application Analytics

submitted by uploading the TEPs to the VOA Acquisition Task Order Management System (ATOMS) by the date and time listed in ATOMS under TEP Due Date. TEP submissions shall be clearly indexed and logically assembled.

Offerors that fail to comply with the provided submission instructions set forth in 7.3.2 of the Basic Contract may be removed from the competition for failure to follow solicitation instructions and therefore, would not be considered for award.

Offerors are advised that TEPs in violation of the stated formatting requirements set forth in 7.3.2.E of the Basic Contract shall not be reformatted by the Government.

If there is a page limit for the Technical Volume, the page limit will be specified in the RTEP.

In the Technical Volume, the Offerors shall propose a detailed technical approach that addresses the following:

- 1) The Offeror's technical approach to satisfying each of the task requirements specified in the PWS.
- 2) A GANTT chart indicating expected start and completion dates, for all project tasks and sub-tasks.
- 3) The estimated level of effort for the Offeror's approach for each task (5.X.X) to include labor categories and associated hours for the Prime and any proposed team members and/or vendors for the base and option period of performance.

This is a Firm Fixed Price type order. Price data shall be provided in accordance with the Basic Contract PWS, paragraph 7.3.2.C.

Price Rounding Notification - The Government requires Offerors to propose unit prices and total prices that are two (2) decimal places and requires the unit prices and total prices to be displayed as two (2) decimal places. Ensure that the two (2) digit unit price multiplied by the item quantity equals the two (2) digit total item price (there should be no rounding).

E. DEFINITIONS

1. Technical Factor Rating Definitions. The Technical Factor rating will be expressed as an adjectival assessment of Outstanding, Good, Acceptable, Susceptible to Being Made Acceptable or Unacceptable.

VistA Application Analytics

a. Outstanding - A TEP that meets or exceeds all of the Government's requirements, demonstrates a thorough understanding of the problems, and is highly feasible (low risk).

b. Good - A TEP that meets or exceeds all of the Government's requirements, demonstrates at least an understanding of the problems and is at least feasible (low to moderate risk).

c. Acceptable - A TEP that at least meets all of the Government's requirements, demonstrates at least a minimal understanding of the problems, and is at least minimally feasible (moderate to high risk).

d. Susceptible to Being Made Acceptable - An approach which, as initially proposed, cannot be rated Acceptable because of minor errors, omissions or deficiencies, which are capable of being corrected without a major rewrite or revision of the TEP. For award without discussions, TEPs with this rating are considered "Unacceptable".

e. Unacceptable - A TEP 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 TEP. A TEP that fails to meet any of the Government's requirements after the final evaluation shall be ineligible for award regardless of whether it can be corrected without a major rewrite or revision of the TEP.

2. Deficiency. A material failure of a TEP to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a TEP that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

3. Strength. Any aspect of a TEP when judged against a stated evaluation criterion, which enhances the merit of the TEP or increases the probability of successful performance of the contract. A significant strength appreciably enhances the merit of a TEP or appreciably increases the probability of successful contract performance.

4. Weakness. A flaw in the TEP that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. A significant weakness in a TEP is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

5. Past Performance Factor Rating: The Past Performance Factor rating shall be expressed as a numerical score. Offerors may receive a maximum possible score of ten (10) points in past performance based on the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) Performance Based Assessments (PBSA), a maximum possible score of five

VistA Application Analytics

(5) points in past performance in achieving small business participation goals, and a maximum possible score of five (5) points in past performance for maintaining or exceeding its Veterans employment percentage of Veterans employed, for a total maximum possible score of twenty (20) points. Less than six (6) months of performance history under T4NG equates to a neutral rating having no positive or negative evaluation significance.

a. QASP PBSAs are completed in accordance with the QASP for each individual task order within the Acquisition Task Order Management System (ATOMS). For the below PBSA metric categories, the rating scores for all PBSAs received for all awarded task orders (cumulative from date of award) are averaged for an overall rating score in each category:

- Technical/Quality of Product or Service
- Project Milestones and Schedule
- Cost and Staffing
- Management

All PBSAs are counted equally (no weighting). The four PBSA metric category scores are then added and averaged, then multiplied by two (2) to calculate one past performance composite score (Maximum composite score is 10).

b. In accordance with H.4, the efforts and results in achieving the small business SB participation percentages, will be considered by the CO in evaluation of prime contractor past performance on future task order awards. In accordance with H.4, the monitoring of contractor performance specifically as it relates to small business participation percentages shall be reviewed by the Small Business Participation Report, Attachment 10, submitted quarterly in ATOMS.

A maximum score of five (5) will be determined based on whether SB participation percentages have been met in the five small business categories below:

- SDVOSB
- VOSB
- WOSB
- HUBZONE
- SDB

The rating score is determined by assigning a score of 1 if the SB goal is met and assigning a score of 0 if it is not met for a maximum score of five (5).

c. In accordance with H.5, the efforts and results in maintaining or exceeding the Veterans employment numbers, will be considered by the CO in evaluation of prime

VistA Application Analytics

contractor past performance on future task order awards. In accordance with H.5, the monitoring of contractor performance specifically as it relates to the Veterans Employment percentage shall be reviewed by the Veterans Employment Report, Attachment 11, submitted quarterly in ATOMS.

The rating score is determined by assigning a score of one (1) if the percentage of current Veterans employed has been maintained. An additional point will be assigned for each full percentage point exceeding the percentage of current Veterans employed set forth in H.5 of the contract up to a maximum of four (4) additional points.

Approved:

Dana Newcomb
Selection Authority