

TECHNICAL EVALUATION FORM – FIRM FIXED PRICE

Solicitation Number T4NG-0739	Task Title VistA Application Analytics
Name of Offeror Offeror A	Date of Proposal
<p><u>1. Technical Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p>TECHNICAL: The evaluation of the Request for Proposal (RFP) considered the following:</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(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.</p> <p><u>2. Proposal Summary:</u></p> <p>Offeror provided a technical approach for the capture of RPC traffic from three VistA systems (5.2.1). They will capture RPC traffic using Kafka, store the RPC traffic using simple storage service (S3) and provide traffic monitoring using Splunk. 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.</p> <p>Offeror A has proposed to team with no subcontractor.</p> <p>After review of the entire technical volume, it was determined that the Offeror's approach contained <i>Deficiencies</i>.</p> <p><u>3. Summary of Significant Strengths:</u> None identified</p> <p><u>4. Summary of Strengths:</u> None identified</p> <p><u>5. Summary of Significant Weaknesses:</u> See Deficiencies.</p> <p><u>6. Summary of Weaknesses:</u> See Deficiencies</p>	<p>Technical Rating:</p> <p>Unacceptable</p>

“Source Selection Information-See FAR [2.101](#) and [3.104](#).”

7. Summary of Deficiencies:

Overview: The following details the non-responsiveness of the offeror's proposal to three of the four base year TEPs and both of the optional year TEPs as specified by the Vista Application Analytics PWS. The overall impression the offeror creates is that they view traffic capture (5.2.1) as the primary work called for by this PWS, rather than merely an enabler for the five analysis tasks. As a result, they greatly under-appreciate that analysis represents the majority of work required, fail to demonstrate that they understand that analysis, and fail to specify how they would perform that analysis.

Deficiency #1 - TEP 5.2.2 requires very specific analysis (requirements a-h) of the RPC traffic of three VistAs captured during TEP 5.2.1. Offeror's approach outlined in tabular form (Table 7, p12) and repeated in narrative/bullet form (page 13) merely restates the TEP's requirements in commitment statements. For example, requirement 5.2.2.e calls for the distinction of "Machine from end Users". Offeror merely commits to provide "Identification and categorization of the machines from which end-users connect to VistA." The same "re-state and commit" approach is taken to all requirements. Mere restatement in a detail-free response shows that the offeror neither understands nor can perform the analysis required. Offeror provides no details about the nature of RPCs in general or the specific RPCs and RPC grouping reduction called for by the requirements. This list of "commit and re-state" statements are evaluated "non-responsive" according to the government's 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 that 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. The offeror's response is a mixture of broad assurance and more specific commitment statements that merely re-state the requirements. Specifically, offeror merely restates requirements in tabular form (Table 8, p13) and again in narrative/bullet form (p15), accompanied by a notional timeline for the broad commitments they make. For example, when called on to validate and verify their analysis, they state they will "conduct verification and validation activities". Requirement 5.2.3.c calls for analysis that distinguishes "Types of user authentication/security and relative use." Offeror responds to this requirement with a commitment statement that rephrases the requirement, "The types of user authentication and security measures used by the clients will be examined, along with their relative usage frequency." Requirement 5.2.3.g calls for "Match(ing) task sets with the use of one or more specific client screens." Offeror responds with a commitment to "Match RPC flows to specific client screens and validate the clinical task sets against real-world workflows." In this case, there is no indication of where screens come from (monitoring users? manuals?) or how matching or validation of matching would occur. Offeror supplies nothing but such commitment statements for all requirements a-m. Overall, the offeror fails to demonstrate they understood the nature of RPCs or how they would match those RPCs to the operation of clients by clinicians. Finally, the offeror's claim, in their notional timeline (page 14), that they can perform a full analysis of VA's three main point-of-care clients in 5 weeks (3 for

analysis, 2 for verification), which is a completely unrealistic estimate and reinforces that they lack understanding of this traffic and the analysis required. Their list of “commit and re-state” statements are evaluated “non-responsive” according to the government’s evaluation criteria.

Deficiency #3 - TEP 5.2.4 calls for recommendations for improvement of client operation based solely on the results of the analysis from TEP 5.2.3. Offeror's broad approach is appropriate, that their "first step involves synthesizing the findings from the Client Use Analysis Reports for the three selected VistA Clients" and "based on the synthesis of the analysis, we will develop a set of recommendations aimed at improving the use of each of the three VistA Clients." However, as the offeror failed to respond to 5.2.3, they failed to demonstrate how they would produce the “Client Use Analysis Reports” in the first place. As a result and in the absence of specifics in this reply, 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. Once again, Offeror commits to performing the requirements by re-stating them. For example, 5.3.1.b requires “Identify the type and volume of users still operating in this VistA” and offeror promises to “Assess the type and volume of users operating within this VistA environment.” Given that this TEP largely calls for a repeat of the analysis performed in the base year, such commitments would have credibility had Offeror’s answers to the base year’s basic analysis TEPs (5.2.2, 5.2.3) been responsive. As they were not, this list of “commit and re-state” statements and the accompanying notional timeline must be evaluated “non-responsive” according to the government’s evaluation criteria.

Deficiency #5 - TEP 5.3.2 calls for specific analysis of the way VistA and its clients provide for community/private-sector care. Offeror’s reply to this TEP follows the same style of commitment made elsewhere, re-stating and paraphrasing requirements without specifying how these commitments will be met. For example, 5.3.2 requires that "client traffic for one month reflecting Community Care from a production VistA shall be isolated and captured" and the offeror commits to "isolate Community Care-related traffic." They add that capture will be (page 24) "configured to specifically target and capture client traffic that reflects Community Care interactions, including parseable text, references to images/screenshots, and other relevant data." This commitment echo's requirements 5.3.2.a, to report on "types, volumes, and sources of parseable text" and 5.3.2.b to report on "Types, volumes, and sources of references to images/screenshots." They go on to re-state a commitment to meet these requirements as well as the TEP’s other requirements. For example, 5.2.4.c calls for analysis of "where and how this (community care) information is displayed in pre-existing and specialized VistA clients." The offeror commits to "map where and how the captured information (text, images, etc.) is displayed within both pre-existing and specialized VistA clients." These are all very specific activities, to isolate community care traffic, to configure capture to specifically target such traffic, to map where and how information is displayed. In no case, does the reply indicate how these tasks will be performed. As elsewhere, the evaluator is meant to assume the offeror has the know-how to meet a requirement but

<p>is given no justification for that assumption. Given that this TEP represents an extension of the analysis performed in the base year, particularly 5.2.3, such commitments could have credibility had the Offeror's answers to the base year's analysis TEPs been responsive. As they were not, this list of "commit and re-state" statements must be evaluated "non-responsive" according to the government's evaluation criteria.</p> <p><u>8. Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>a. Understanding of the Problem</u> As evidenced by the deficiencies above, overall the Offeror demonstrates a lack of understanding of the problems.</p> <p><u>b. Feasibility of Approach</u> As evidenced by the deficiencies above, overall the Offeror demonstrates an approach that cannot be expected to meet the requirements.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p>Evaluator Signature</p>	<p>Date</p>