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| **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 A | | 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).  The Offeror’s response described its technical and management solution to the problem identified in the Performance Work Statement (PWS) while maintaining REVAMP 1.0 capabilities within the current application.  Offeror A’s proposed approach includes creating two separate REVAMP environments to avoid contamination of the REVAMP 2.0 release build, one for Quality Assurance validation and verification and another for a release environment. The proposal describes how the Offeror will enhance the REVAMP application to production-grade quality using the Agile development practices, introduce a flexible Javascript / Bootstrap-based user interface, and deploy the product in production via the Connected Health App Compliance Review process. A detailed GANTT chart was 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 one Significant Strength and two Strengths detailed below. The remainder of the REVAMP requirements was adequately addressed.  **3. Summary of Significant Strengths and Strengths:**  **Significant Strength #1:** (TEP pp 11-12, Section 2.1.3; PWS 5.4.3, RTEP B.1.1) Offeror A provides a highly detailed explanation of its approach for executing and delivering patient notifications by e-mail and text messaging. Patients need to be notified of the tasks they should perform on the REVAMP application during their evaluation and these reminders will help guide them through this process. Offeror A proposes an approach that demonstrates a thorough understanding of the importance of being able to design a flexible, dynamic, and event driven messaging system that meets patient preferences and promotes patient engagement. The auto-generated messages will contain a link to the portal allowing the patient to navigate to REVAMP from the notification. Additionally, the Offeror’s approach includes the ability for patients to choose the method of notification by text message, email or both while the PWS only required auto-generated email notifications. Offeror A’s approach will significantly facilitate the ability to perform the patient’s evaluation in a timely manner. This will reduce delays in scheduling thereby appreciably improving the efficiencies of diagnosing and initiating treatment of patients.  **Strength #1**:  (TEP 2.1.2, p 8, PWS 5.4.2 RTEP B.1.1)   In its approach for additional PAP Data and Graphs, the Offeror included a detailed explanation for upgrading the graphical technologies underpinning the REVAMP platform.  The Offeror proposes to incorporate a graphing system based completely on Javascript and Javascript Object Notation (JSON).  JSON is a text format that is an independent language format and is used primarily to transmit data between server and web application. Offeror A’s proposed approach implements a data-driven graphing system which is not only faster and more capable but also increases the number of graph types that would become available. Both clinicians and Veterans will be able to switch between numerous graph types such as bar graphs, line graphs and more complex graph types allowing different views of the same data. Offeror A’s proposed approach would also allow for configuration options changes that can be accomplished in the database without requiring a new build of the application code or a re-deployment. It is highly probable that REVAMP clinician and patient end-users will request more graphical displays for other data elements after the system is deployed.  Overall, the Offeror’s proposed approach allows the Government greater flexibility in the displaying of REVAMP data with faster response time to end user request for additional data displays.  **Strength #2** (TEP pp 9-10, 2.1.2.2, PWS 5.4.2.2, Request for Task Execution Plan (RTEP) B.1.1) In its approach the Offeror included a highly detailed explanation for how it would enhance REVAMP to generate and display the patient Positive Airway Pressure (PAP) usage in a 24-hour period to clinician and patient end-users.  The Offeror recognized that being able to set “threshold values” for mask leakage within the REVAMP application is a critical dependency for being able to generate the patient PAP usage in a 24-hour period.  The Offeror proposed approach incorporates configuring REVAMP to identify these threshold values, and even make them configurable by patient within the application.  This additional configuration will help make REVAMP more adaptable to patients that may have more mask leakage than normal.  Offeror A’s inclusion of this nuanced approach in its proposal is indicative of a strong understanding of the requirements as depicted in the PWS.  Overall, the Offerors knowledge in the clinical subject matter and PAP devices and solid approach for development of a graphical display of the patient’s PAP usage demonstrates an approach that increases the Government’s confidence of the Offeror’s ability to successfully provide the development and enhancements required for REVAMP.  **4. Summary of Significant Weaknesses and Weaknesses:**  None identified.  **5. Summary of Deficiencies**:  None identified  **6. Special Terms and Conditions / Deviation / Critical Assumptions stated in TEP:**  None identified.  **7. Evaluation Criteria:**  **a. Understanding of the Problem**  Overall, the Offeror’s TEP demonstrated at least an understanding of the requirements.  **b. Feasibility of Approach**  Overall, the Offeror’s TEP demonstrated an approach that is considered at least feasible and is considered low to moderate risk.  **8. Rating:**  Good  Offeror A’s TEP that met or exceeded all of the Government’s requirements, demonstrated at least an understanding of the problems, and is at least feasible (low to moderate risk). | | **Technical Rating:**  Good |
|  | |  |
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|  | | |
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