T4NG TASK ORDER (TO) EVALUATION PLAN

**VistA Adaptive Maintenance**

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 threefollowing evaluation Factors: Technical, Price, and Past Performance. The Technical Factor is significantlymore important than the Price Factor, which is slightly 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 - All TEPs 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. TEPs 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.

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 TEP 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.

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 Survey 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 of10 points in past performance, a maximum possible score of five points in past performance in achieving small business participation percentages, and a maximum of five points for maintaining or exceeding Veterans employment percentage of Veterans employed for a total maximum possible score of 20 points.

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 Performance Work Statement (PWS), paragraph 7.3.2. Offerors are permitted to provide ONLY ONE (1) TEP for consideration.

There is a 20-page limitation for the Technical Volume. In the Technical Volume, the Offerors shall propose a detailed technical approach that addresses the following:

1. Developing a service layer to emulate Computerized Patient Retrieval System (CPRS) Remote Procedure Calls (RPCs) for select data read functions [PWS 5.2.1 and all subparagraphs]. Specifically, the Offeror’s technical approach shall include the following:
2. FileMan data modeling using web-standard technologies and representation
3. Distinguishing VA-specific from generic healthcare patterns
4. Implementing MUMPS emulation using javascript/Node.js-driven, model-driven replacement.
5. Comprehensive analysis of logic of CPRS client and its RPC interfaces
6. Operationalizing JSON models on NoSQL data stores
7. Analysis of JLV and its VPR interface
8. A final solution that has no legacy MUMPS dependencies.
9. Developing a service layer to emulate CPRS RPCs for select data read/write transactional functions for Outpatient Pharmacy Computerized Physician Order Entry (CPOE) [PWS 5.2.2]. Specifically, the Offeror’s technical approach shall include the following:
   1. FileMan data modeling using web-standard technologies and representation
   2. Distinguishing VA-specific from generic healthcare patterns
   3. Implementing MUMPS emulation using javascript/Node.js-driven, model-driven replacement.
   4. Comprehensive analysis of logic of CPRS client and its RPC interfaces
   5. Operationalizing JSON models on NoSQL data stores
   6. A final solution that has no legacy MUMPS dependencies.
10. Automated testing of all emulation, including comprehensive regression test suite [PWS 5.5.5 and all subparagraphs]
11. Initial Operating Capability (IOC) Support to demonstrate that, as a result of its approach to PWS 5.2.1 and 5.2.2, CPRS is able to retain full functionality against a single centralized service, replacing those functions of the original, de-centralized VistA source instances. The Offeror’s approach shall indicate its approach to retirement of that service in the local, de-centralized instances, while maintaining full continuity of service in the CPRS client [PWS 5.2 and 5.6].
12. Progress its solution to 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 to national deployment following IOC such that CPRS is able to retain full functionality against a single centralized service, replacing those functions of the original, 131 de-centralized VistA source instances. The Offeror’s approach shall indicate its approach to retirement of that service in the 131, de-centralized VistA instances, while maintaining full continuity of service in the CPRS client [PWS 5.7].
13. The estimated level of effort (LOE) for the Offeror’s approach for PWS sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6, and 5.7 and all subparagraphs, to include labor categories and associated hours for the Prime and any proposed team member and/or vendor (the prime and each subcontractor should be shown independently for the base and option periods throughout the period of performance). For purposes of level of effort only task level is defined as 5.X.X.

This is a firm fixed pricetype order. Price/Cost data shall be provided in accordance with the Basic Contract PWS, paragraph 7.3.2 C.

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.

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.
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