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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:**  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**:  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.  Task Requirements   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | PWS | Description | Technical Volume | Description | | 5.2.2(a)  Page 8 | User Volume | Page 7-8 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.2(b)  Page 8 | Client types and volume of use | Page 7-8 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.2(c)  Page 8 | Connection volumes, frequency, and duration | Page 7-8 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.2(d)  Page 8 | Types of user authentication/security and relative use | Page 7-8 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.2(e)  Page 8 | Machine from end Users | Page 7-8 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.2(f)  Page 8 | RPC usage frequency and execution times | Page 7-8 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.2(g)  Page 8 | RPC groupings representing transactions | Page 7-8 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.2(h)  Page 8 | RPCs specific to a VistA from cross-VistA RPCs | Page 7-8 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(a)  Page 8 | User volumes and types. User types shall capture clinical care specialties and roles | Page 9 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(b)  Page 8 | Connection volume and duration, tying frequency of client use to user types | Page 9 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(c)  Page 8 | Types of user authentication/security and relative use | Page 9 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(d)  Page 8 | Patient volumes | Page 9 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(e)  Page 8 | Enumeration of all RPCs used by a client and their relative use | Page 9 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(f)  Page 8 | Distinction of clinical from non-clinical RPCs | Page 9 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(g)  Page 8 | Distinction of RPCs that change (write)from those that read the clinical record | Page 9 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(h)  Page 8 | Distinction of slow running, high overhead and variable overhead RPCs | Page 9 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(i)  Page 8 | Clinical care task sets, represented as groups of RPCs used in tandem | Page 9 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(j)  Page 9 | Match task sets with the use of one or more specific client screens | Page 9 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(k)  Page 9 | Task sets employed by different user types | Page 9 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(l)  Page 9 | Isolate performance issues with patterns of use that slow care | Page 9 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.3(m)  Page 9 | Verification and validation that the analysis accurately captures care provision | Page 9 | Nonresponsive | | 5.2.4  Page 9 | Based solely 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 10 | Nonresponsive.  Not feasible to deliver as it depends on successful Client Use Analysis tasks [5.2.3] | | 5.3.1  Page 9 | Migrated Vista client traffic analysis | Page 11 | 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 12 | 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** |
|  | | |