|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T4 TECHNICAL EVALUATION FORM – FIRM FIXED PRICE & TIME-AND-MATERIALS** | | |
| T4 Number  T4-0605 | Task Title  Software Development for Remote Veteran Sleep Apnea Management Platform | |
| Name of Offeror  Offeror B | | Date of Proposal  June 11, 2015 |
| **1. Technical Evaluation Criteria:**  TECHNICAL: The evaluation of the technical proposal considered the following:  (1) Understanding of the Problem – The Technical Volume of the Task Execution Plan (TEP) was 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.  (2) Feasibility of Approach –The Technical Volume was evaluated to determine the extent to which the proposed approach is workable and the end results achievable. The Technical Volume was 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.  The Government reserves the right to evaluate the Offeror’s proposed labor rates to determine if the proposed rates are unrealistically low in order to assess the ability of the Offeror to meet the Performance Work Statement (PWS) requirements and whether the proposal provides the Government with a high level of confidence of successful performance. Unrealistically low labor rates proposed for a significant quantity of the total labor hours may indicate a high-risk approach to contract performance. Since the proposed labor rates are binding, the Government’s price evaluation shall not be adjusted as a result of this analysis due to the fact that the Government is not performing a cost realism analysis. However, if the Government deems it necessary to conduct discussions, and as a result of those discussions an Offeror adjusts its labor rates, then those revised labor rates will also be assessed under the Price Factor. This analysis, if undertaken, is for the limited purpose of aiding the agency in measuring the risk of the Offeror’s approach to meeting the solicitation requirements.  **2. Proposal Summary:** The Offeror provided a technical and management approach to conducting application development, modernization, and operations and maintenance activities for the Remote Veteran Sleep Apnea Management Platform (REVAMP).  Offeror B began its TEP with a general background of the REVAMP project. The Offeror’s response described its technical and management solution to the problem identified in the Performance Work Statement (PWS).  The proposal describes how the Offeror will enhance the REVAMP application with Agile processes to leverage existing code from the REVAMP 1.0 Github repository.  The response also includes a discussion on the Offeror’s approach to management processes to advance the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) Innovations Program Office objectives. Finally, some graphs and a detailed GANTT chart were also provided  The Offeror has proposed to team with one subcontractor.  After review of the entire proposal, it was determined that the Offeror’s approach contained two Strengths detailed below. The remainder of the REVAMP requirements was adequately addressed.  **3. Summary of Significant Strengths and Strengths:**  **Strength #1:** (TEP 2.2, p 12, PWS Section 5.4. Request for Task Execution Plan B.1.1) In its proposed approach for utilizing Agile development methodology with all aspects of the Software Development Life Cycle to develop the REVAMP 2.0 Enhancements, Offeror B describes how it will analyze dependencies on changing non-functional requirements during the course of its development planning.  Doing this will allow for the assessment of the “technical debt”, or the level of effort that is needed to factor in for unplanned non-functional requirements.  The inclusion of this step in its planning process is beneficial because while VA’s non-functional requirements do change, this is often overlooked which can lead to schedule slippage, and the mutual frustration of Government representatives and contractors.  Offeror B’s inclusion of the technical debt analysis in the planning session would result in a more viable implementation plan, increasing feasibility of the baseline plan and decreasing overall project risk.  **Strength #2:** (TEP 2.2.1, pp 14-16, PWS 5.4.1, RTEP B.1.1)  The Offeror provides a detailed explanation of its proposed approach for executing and delivering a redesign of the REVAMP landing pages. The landing page is the first impression users will have of the REVAMP application and is critical in determining their acceptance of the portal. Offeror B proposes to schedule Joint Application Design sessions to obtain input from a wide range of stakeholders, including patient representatives. This feedback from multiple interested parties will help ensure end-user overall satisfaction. In support of its proposed approach, Offeror B provided samples of similar issues and how its multiple feedback approach successfully resulted in a landing page portraying different sets of images. Additionally, the Offeror proposed approach includes testing the resulting landing pages with every sprint, which ensure that no functionality is lost and performance issues are not introduced as user load increases. Overall, Offeror B’s approach and expertise with redesign of the landing pages increases the Government’s confidence in the Offeror’s ability to deliver the requirements of the PWS.  **4. Summary of Significant Weaknesses and Weaknesses:**  None identified.  **5. Summary of Deficiencies**:  None identified.  **Special Terms and Conditions / Deviation / Critical Assumptions stated in TEP:**  None identified.  **6. Evaluation Criteria:**  **a. Understanding of the Problem**  Overall, Offeror B’s TEP demonstrated at least a minimal understanding of the requirements.  **b. Feasibility of Approach**  Overall, Offeror B’s TEP demonstrated an approach that is considered is at least minimally feasible and is considered moderate to high risk.  **7. Rating:**  Acceptable  Offeror B’s TEP at least met all of the Government’s requirements, demonstrated at least a minimal understanding of the problems, and is at least minimally feasible (moderate to high risk). | | **Technical Rating:**  Acceptable |
|  | |  |
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