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| T4 Number  T4NG-0163 | Task Title  Pharmacy Reengineering Architecture, Database Administration and System Administration | |
| Name of Offeror  Offeror B | | Date of Proposal  April 24, 2017 |
| **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.  **2. Proposal Summary:**  Offeror B provided a technical and management approach to providing program architecture, database administrator and system administrator technical support to enable the Pharmacy Reengineering Program, projects, and VIP Build Cycle to progress. The proposal describes how Offeror B will provide support leveraging resources with overall PRE program knowledge as well as proposing enhancements to current processes, additional tools to streamline work among the program, and plan to work on creating common reusable design patterns. The proposal includes technical details of the PRE program. The response also includes a summary of Offeror B’s approach to the management or enhancement of processes to advance the PRE objectives including planning for enterprise, long range technical or budgetary impacts. Finally, the proposal outlines staffing levels by Labor Category including the project staffing resource experience and qualification.  Offeror B has proposed to team with three subcontractors.  After review of the entire proposal, it was determined that Offeror B’s approach contained the Strengthsdetailed below. The remainder of the PRE Architecture, Database Administration and System Administration requirements was adequately addressed.  **3. Summary of Significant Strengths and Strengths:**  **Significant Strength #1**: (TEP p 13-15 Section 2.3.2, Request for Task Execution Plan (RTEP) B.1.3, Performance Work Statement (PWS) 5.2.3) In its proposed approach for System and Database Administration, Offeror B proposes to modify the existing PRE Administration page to include notifications and system alerts. Including notifications and automating communications in a central location reduces the risk of the appropriate resource not knowing critical information when researching or troubleshooting a system. Storing this information in a centralized location would allow more resources access to critical information without the need for the government to grant higher levels of access to the system to more members of the team while maintaining security of information facilitate more efficient troubleshooting by the project team which will aid the team to meet schedule. Offeror B also proposes the use of additional software tool support to PRE such as FlyWay or Liquibase to streamline and improve Database Administration efficiency. Additional tools, such as FlyWay or Liquibase, facilitate the management of version control of different versions of multiple components deployed in various environments like PRE. Since PRE has multiple components that interconnect, it is important to maintain version control in each environment to ensure code is not lost or inappropriate versions are not published to the wrong environment which could cause schedule delays or patient safety issues. Troubleshooting version control related issues are time-consuming and resource intensive. The Offeror’s proposed approach to utilize additional tools reduces the risk to the Government for loss in schedule due to version control issues. Furthermore, Offeror B’s proposed approach includes a process improvement for receiving exports of production databases from Pharmacy Product System National and VistA for use in Development/Test environments on a regular basis to mitigate schedule delay in ad hoc backup requests. This is important because PRE system databases have to be in sync. If data is not in sync then corrupt data can be mistaken for software deficiencies. Lack of data synchronization causes delays in testing and troubleshooting. Reducing the risk of extended troubleshooting of system or database issues; timely research version control issues; and troubleshooting data synchronization issues improves the Government’s ability to remain on schedule. Having current production backups on hand mitigates the schedule risk of requesting a backup and the waiting time for receiving requested backup. Overall, Offeror B’s triaged approach for System and Database Administration reduces the risk of schedule delays or deploying inappropriate components to production which appreciably increases the likelihood of successful completion of all of the PWS requirements.  **Significant Strength #2:** (TEP pp 16-17 Section 2.4, RTEP B.1.4, PWS 5.2.6) In its proposed approach for implementation support, Offeror B provides steps to improve the PRE program. For example, Offeror B proposes to work on creating common reusable design patterns for PRE Teams and seek opportunities for the sharing of common code and tools reuse across teams. With several individual projects that entail the PRE program, it is not unusual for the individual projects to isolate themselves and disregard that each project must collaborate for the overall program to be successful. Currently there are no standard operating procedures for development or continuous integration for PRE systems. Offeror B’s proposed approach includes working with stakeholders and management, and creating common reusable design patterns and to seek opportunities for code refactoring, consolidation of common code and reducing technical debt. Ultimately this will reduce redundancy and shorten the development lifecycle for all PRE teams with standardized frameworks. Offeror B’s proposed approach demonstrates thorough understandings of the Governments need to streamline, become more efficient and modernized. Offeror B’s approach will significantly reduce the risk to the Government during multi-year budget planning and project planning which appreciably increases the confidence in the Offeror’s ability to deliver requirements.  **Strength #1**: (TEP p 7 Section 2.1, RTEP B.1.1 b, PWS 5.2.1) In its proposed approach of how PRE technology multi-level dependencies will be identified and analyzed while maintaining Technical Reference Model compliance, Offeror B proposes to build upon the established reusable processes while working iterations using Maven dependency reports and spreadsheets to manage the dependencies by evolving established processes through additional automation to streamline the process. The Offeror’s proposed utilization of Maven increases build capabilities and strengthens the Government’s troubleshooting and correcting problems abilities which raises productivity and code confidence. Offeror B’s proposed approach addresses the need to streamline processes and leverage existing processes in order to increase productivity, lower the technical debt and not create new technical debt within the program. Offeror B’s approach will reduce the risk of schedule delays, version control issues and potential for not obtaining release approvals which increases the confidence in the Offeror’s ability to deliver the requirements in the PWS.  **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 demonstrates a thorough understanding of the requirements.  **b. Feasibility of Approach**  Overall, the Offeror demonstrates an approach that is considered highly feasible and is considered low risk.  **8. Rating:**  Outstanding  Offeror B’s TEP exceeded all of the Government’s requirements, demonstrated a thorough understanding of the problems, and is highly feasible (low risk). | | **Technical Rating:**  Outstanding |
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