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| **T4NG TECHNICAL EVALUATION FORM – FIRM FIXED PRICE** | | |
| T4 Number  T4NG-0110 | Task Title  HPS Tier 3 Sustainment Support: Administrative | |
| Name of Offeror  Offeror C | | Date of Proposal  December 16, 2016 |
| **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 C provided a technical and management approach for supporting Tier 3 sustainment needs for Health Product Support (HPS) Administrative applications. Offeror C in its Task Execution Plan (TEP) provided their understanding and approach with the use of Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL) Service Delivery and Scaled Agile expertise to form a partnership framework with HPS. The Offeror expands on this framework with the design and use of a HPS Playbook for the definition and documentation of standards, processes, and performance metrics for the execution of activities to meet timeliness requirements. The Offeror will follow the Veteran-focused Integration Process (VIP) guidance and will tailor it to meet HPS requirements with use of a Veteran-Focused Sustainment Process (VSP). This will integrate portfolio and Agile service delivery to promote efficient and timely defect resolutions. Offeror C‘s team structure involves partnership with Tier 2 with the use of their concept of the one ticket/one team approach. Its team will have maintenance support, VistA development, Non-VistA development, and compliance support groups for insuring quality delivery services, best practices, qualified staff, and cohesiveness within the HPS organization. Root cause analysis and a Defect Analysis Report will be provided for each backlog ticket issue to insure the efficient and timely release of solutions. The Offeror will use a Tiger Team for the backlog work related to intake and analysis. The Offeror provided its approach to application specific tasks for Health Level Seven integration, 508 compliance, and ATO for the Administrative applications.  The Offeror provided a level of effort table for the Base Period, all Option Periods, and Optional Tasks 1,2,3, and 6. The Offeror did not include LOE for Optional Task 10.  The Offeror has proposed to team with three subcontractors.  After review of the entire proposal, it was determined that the Offeror’s approach containedno Strengths or Weaknesses but did contain one Deficiency noted below.  **3. Summary of Significant Strengths and Strengths:**  None identified.  **4. Summary of Significant Weaknesses and Weaknesses:**  None identified.  **5. Summary of Deficiencies**  **Deficiency #1** (TEP, p 21, Section 2; Performance Work Statement (PWS) 5.10.7; Request for Task Execution Plan (RTEP) B.1.2): RTEP instructions B.1.2 clearly states that the Offeror is to provide its “level of effort (LOE) for the 12-month base period and each 12-month option period and for each optional tasks (excluding OTs 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9). Level of effort should also be provided for Optional Tasks 1, 2, and 10 at the 5.X X level and at the 5.10.X.X level for Optional Tasks 3 and 8”.  Offeror C failed to provide its LOE for Optional Task 10, Out Year Continued Product Sustainment Support.  The PWS requires continued sustainment support with all  the services and deliverables identified in Section 5.1, 5.3 through 5.9 and all subparagraphs for up to 10 (High) large applications, 15 (Medium) medium applications, and 20 (Low) small applications throughout the task order period of performance for all option periods. It is important to have the Offeror’s LOE to determine if it understands and can provide resources to meet the requirements of these optional tasks. Additionally, the LOE provided by Offeror C for Optional Task 2, Intake of Additional Admin Applications, Optional Task 3, Initial Section 508 Conformance and Optional Task 6, Initial HL7 Compliancy does not detail whether or not the amount provided is for the entire task order period of performance or for each exercise of each respective optional task.  For example, Optional Task 2, Intake of Additional Admin Applications may be exercised up to 10 times for the overall period of performance for up to 12 months each exercise.  Offeror C provided a total of 1,560 hours for the intake of large applications, 1,120 hours for the intake of medium applications and 720 hours for the small applications for a total of 3,400 hours.  Offeror C does not detail as to whether the proposed hours are to represent LOE for 12 months or the entire 60 month period of performance. Offeror C provided subscripts for each in its proposal but did not include any explanation as to what those subscripts meant.  It must be specified what the hours represent so that the proper LOE can be accurately evaluated by the Government. Offeror C’s omission of its LOE for Optional Task 10 coupled with its lack of detail of the LOE allotment for the above discussed Optional Tasks increases the risk for unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.    **6. Special Terms and Conditions / Deviation / Critical Assumptions stated in TEP:**  None identified.  **7. Evaluation Criteria:**  **a. Understanding of the Problem**  Overall, due to the one Deficiency identified, Offeror C’s understanding of the problem cannot be determined.  **b. Feasibility of Approach**  Overall, due to the one Deficiency identified, the Offeror C’s feasibility of approach cannot be determined.    **8. Rating:**  Susceptible to Being Made Acceptable  Offeror C’s TEP, as initially proposed, cannot be rated Acceptable because of the one Deficiency identified, which is capable of being corrected without a major rewrite or revision of the TEP. | | **Technical Rating:**  Susceptible to Being Made Acceptable |
|  | |  |
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