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| **TECHNICAL EVALUATION FORM – FIRM FIXED PRICE** | | |
| Solicitation Number  T4NG-0739 | Task Title  VistA Application Analytics | |
| Name of Offeror  Offeror A | | 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:**  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.  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**:  Note ‘Nonresponsive’ means the offeror did not address the requirement. The offeror either merely restated the requirement or stated that the requirement will be met without providing supporting rationale. Impact: Each deficiency indicates a lack of understanding of the problem and associated lack of feasible approach.  Deficiency #1: PWS 5.2.2 page 7 par 5; Technical Volume page 12 par 3 and 4; Understanding; Feasibility)  PWS requirement 5.2.2 is “Using the client traffic captured (deliverable 5.2.1A) , the Contractor shall provide Traffic Analysis Reports comprising the complete client traffic for each of the three analyzed VistAs. In addition, the Contractor shall provide a Cross VistA Analysis Report distinguishing cross-VistA from VistA-specific traffic patterns”.  The Offerors understanding of the problem is “Understanding: The VAEC serves as a critical platform for hosting VistA… The deliverable of Traffic Analysis Reports for each VistA is intended to provide a comprehensive understanding of user interaction, system usage patterns, and the flow of Remote Procedure Calls (RPCs) within and across VistA instances.”  The Offerors approach to the problem is “  Task Requirements   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | PWS | Description | Technical Volume | Description | | 5.2.2(a)  Page 8 | User Volume | Page 13 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.2(b)  Page 8 | Client types and volume of use | Page 13 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.2(c)  Page 8 | Connection volumes, frequency, and duration | Page 13 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.2(d)  Page 8 | Types of user authentication/security and relative use | Page 13 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.2(e)  Page 8 | Machine from end Users | Page 13 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.2(f)  Page 8 | RPC usage frequency and execution times | Page 13 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.2(g)  Page 8 | RPC groupings representing transactions | Page 13 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.2(h)  Page 8 | RPCs specific to a VistA from cross-VistA RPCs | Page 13 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(a)  Page 8 | User volumes and types. User types shall capture clinical care specialties and roles | Page 15 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(b)  Page 8 | Connection volume and duration, tying frequency of client use to user types | Page 15 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(c)  Page 8 | Types of user authentication/security and relative use | Page 15 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(d)  Page 8 | Patient volumes | Page 15 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(e)  Page 8 | Enumeration of all RPCs used by a client and their relative use | Page 15 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(f)  Page 8 | Distinction of clinical from non-clinical RPCs | Page 15 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(g)  Page 8 | Distinction of RPCs that change (write)from those that read the clinical record | Page 15 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(h)  Page 8 | Distinction of slow running, high overhead and variable overhead RPCs | Page 15 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(i)  Page 8 | Clinical care task sets, represented as groups of RPCs used in tandem | Page 15 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(j)  Page 9 | Match task sets with the use of one or more specific client screens | Page 15 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(k)  Page 9 | Task sets employed by different user types | Page 15 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(l)  Page 9 | Isolate performance issues with patterns of use that slow care | Page 15 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(m)  Page 9 | Verification and validation that the analysis accurately captures care provision | Page 15 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.4  Page 9 | Based soley on the Client Use Analysis [5.2.3] the Contractor shall provide recommendations to upgrade the use of the top three RPC-using Point-of-Care VistA Clients to deliver better clinical care. | Page 16 | Nonresponsive.  Not feasible as this depends on successful Client Use Analysis [5.2.3] | | 5.3.1  Page 9 | Migrated Vista client traffic analysis | Page 20 | Not feasible as this depends on successful completion of Base Period tasks (5.2.2, 5.2.3, and 5.2.4) | | 5.3.2  Page 10 | Vista community care client traffic analysis | Page 22 | Not feasible as this depends on successful completion of Base Period tasks (5.2.2, 5.2.3, and 5.2.4) |   **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. | | **Technical Rating:**  Unacceptable |
|  | |  |
| **Evaluator Signature** | | **Date** |
|  | | |