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| **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:  (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:** *Provide a summary of the offeror’s technical volume to include its technical approach and any RFP discriminators such as level of effort, management methodology, and any additional requests for documentation such as a transition plan or project management plan. Do not include technical opinions. Simply Summarize.*  *The below is provided only as an example. Proposal summaries must be tailored for each Offeror’s proposal.*  The Offeror provided a technical and management approach to conducting application development, modernization, and operations and maintenance (O&M) activities using the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Agile Framework.  The Offeror’s response described the technical and management solution to the problem identified in the Performance Work Statement (PWS). The proposal describes how the Offeror will implement a common services framework, implement Agile processes compliant with the CBP Agile Framework, and provide opportunities to leverage their corporate expertise by providing the Government access to annual innovation workshops and senior technical subject matter experts at no direct cost to the Government. The response also includes a discussion on the Offeror’s approach to management processes to advance the Cargo Systems Program Office’s (CSPO) objectives. Finally, the proposal outlines the staffing levels by labor category and also the project staffing resource experience and qualification.  Offeror A has proposed to team with one subcontractor.  After review of the entire technical volume, it was determined that the Offeror’s approach contained *{add/remove as appropriate-*no Significant Strengths, Strengths, Significant Weaknesses, Weaknesses, or Deficiencies; the Strength detailed below}.  The remainder of Organization Transition and Alignment Support Services requirements were adequately addressed.  If specific RFP evaluation criteria and/or discriminators are not mentioned below, the Agency has determined that the Offeror’s technical response(s) for those respective criteria and/or discriminators met the Government’s minimum requirements.  ***Evaluation Assessment:*** *As you read the technical volume, you must keep in mind that the Offeror was required to address each Evaluation Plan discriminator. An Evaluation Plan may not include a requirement to address all tasks in the Performance Work Statement.*  *Please also keep in mind that if a discriminator is not addressed in the technical approach as required, an assessment of a Deficiency (D) is warranted.*  *For any special term, condition or assumption proposed by the Offeror that is negative or unacceptable, assess as a Weakness (W), Significant Weakness (SW), or D below. To determine which one, it is helpful to consider whether keeping in the term, condition, or assumption would introduce an unacceptable risk to the program or just increase the risk.*  *When writing a Strength (S)/W/D, please consider what the PWS required, what the proposal stated, and the benefit/risk to the program. These elements should be addressed in your S, W, or D write up as part of supporting it.*  **Instructions for Assessing Significant Strengths and Strengths:** *Provide all significant strengths (SS) and strengths (S).* ***For each identified SS and S, cite the Technical Volume page number, paragraph and corresponding PWS Paragraph, and RFP Discriminator.*** *Important to note that identification of SS and S MUST be against discriminators. Ensure that impact statements accompany each SS and S.*  *As you identify SS or S, please assess if it demonstrates an “understanding of the problems” or the “feasibility of approach.” Please ensure to include a statement of understanding or feasibility in every SS or S identified below.*  ***Please review the definition of a SS & S as identified in the Evaluation Plan.***  **3. Summary of Significant Strengths:** None Identified.  **Significant Strength** **#1** (Technical Volume pg. 15, paragraph 4.8; PWS 5.2; RFP Discriminator X). The offeror proposes a plan and process to implement the test system through the technique of “virtualization”. This approach demonstrates the offeror’s understanding and ability to reduce unnecessary resource allocation and provide enhanced test processes, which would significantly reduce the cost of the infrastructure to stand up the environments. (*Excellent impact statement which demonstrates the importance of virtualization.*)  **Significant Strength #2 (proper citation): XXXXX, etc.**  **4. Summary of Strengths:**  **Strength #1 (proper citation): XXXXX, etc**  **Instructions for Assessing Significant Weaknesses and Weaknesses:** *Provide all significant weaknesses (SW) and weaknesses (W).* ***For each identified SW and W, cite the Technical Volume page number, paragraph and corresponding PWS Paragraph, and RFP Discriminator.*** *Important to note that identification of SW and W is against discriminators; however any technical mistake should not be ignored, even if not made against a discriminator. Under these cases, a discussion with contracting team is warranted. Ensure that impact/risk statements accompany each SW and W.*  *As you identify SW or W, please assess if it relates to “understanding of the problems” or the “feasibility of approach.” Please ensure to include a statement of understanding or feasibility in every SW or W identified below.*  ***Please review the definition of a SW & W as identified in the Evaluation Plan.***  **5. Summary of Significant Weaknesses:**  **Example:**  **Significant Weakness #1 (**Technical Volume, Page 20; PWS Paragraph #; RFP Discriminator X**):** The proposal demonstrates a significant lack of understanding of how to execute the site survey.  The proposal lacks insight into how the initial access point locations would be defined prior to conducting the site survey.  The proposal states the Offeror will hypothesize the access point locations per floor, but provides no further details regarding the analytics that would be used prior to the site survey or to create that hypothesis.  Further, the proposal lacks sufficient detail in describing the iterative process for maturing the network design from the initial access point locations to defining the final access point locations, nor does the proposal define the basis for modifying access point locations.   The Offeror’s approach to executing the site survey process is not workable, and is based on a proposed timeline that is extremely aggressive and high risk.  **6. Summary of Weaknesses:**  **Weakness #1 (**Technical Volume, Page X; PWS Paragraph #; RFP Discriminator X**):**  **Weakness #2 (**Technical Volume, Page X; PWS Paragraph #; RFP Discriminator X**):**  **Instructions for Assessing Deficiencies:** *Provide all deficiencies.* ***For each identified deficiency, cite the Technical Volume page number, paragraph and corresponding PWS Paragraph and RFP Discriminator.*** *Important to note that identification of Deficiency(ies) are against discriminators; however any technical mistake should not be ignored, even if not made against a discriminator. Under these cases, a discussion with contracting team is warranted. Ensure that impact statements accompany each deficiency.*  *Keep in mind that failing to address a discriminator is a material failure to meet a requirement.*  *As you identify a Deficiency be sure to relate the concern to “understanding of the problems” or the “feasibility of approach.” Please ensure to include a statement of understanding or feasibility in every Deficiency identified below.*  ***Please review the definition of a Deficiency as identified in the Evaluation Plan.***  **7. Summary of Deficiencies**:  **Example:**  **Deficiency -** (Technical Volume, page 23; PWS Paragraph #; RFP Discriminator X): The offeror’s proposed use of a “Forwarder” requires the delivery of mail first to the legacy Exchange system and then forwards it to the Cloud Service Provider (CSP). This approach requires that VA maintain the current existing user(s) mailbox throughout the period of performance. This approach fails to meet the Government’s requirements, as the Government will not be maintaining the existing user(s) mailbox beyond migration “TO.” The offeror’s migration approach transfers the entire burden for maintaining existing systems, hardware, software, bandwidth and troubleshooting for the existing user(s) mailbox to the Government.  The Offeror’s migration approach increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.  **8. Evaluation Criteria:**  **a. Understanding of the Problem**  *Provide a summation of the offeror’s* ***understanding of the problem*** *as derived from the recommended rating definition: Outstanding, Good, Acceptable, Susceptible to Being Acceptable or Unacceptable.*  ***Example:*** *If recommended rating is Acceptable, follow the definition:*  Overall, the Offeror demonstrated at least a minimal understanding of the problems.  **b. Feasibility of Approach**  *Provide a summation of the offeror’s* ***feasibility of approach*** *as derived from the recommended rating definition for: Outstanding, Good, Acceptable, Susceptible to Being Acceptable or Unacceptable*  ***Example:*** *If recommended rating is Acceptable, follow the definition:*  Overall, the Offeror’s approach is at least minimally feasible and is considered moderate to high risk.  **9. Rating:** *Outstanding, Good, Acceptable, Susceptible to Being Acceptable or Unacceptable.* ***[Derived from Evaluation Plan Definitions]***  ***Simply provide the definition of the rating from the Evaluation Plan.***  ***Example:***    **Rating: Acceptable -** A Proposal 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). | | **Technical Rating:**  Outstanding  Good  Acceptable  Susceptible to Being Made Acceptable  Unacceptable |
|  | |  |
| **Evaluator Signature**  *Only one signature should be provided even if multiple technical evaluators participated. The lead technical evaluator should sign and date the technical reports.* | | **Date** |
|  | | |