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| **T4 TECHNICAL EVALUATION FORM – FIRM FIXED PRICE & TIME-AND-MATERIALS** | | |
| T4 Number  T4-0595 | Task Title  VistA Integration Adapter Enhancements | |
| Name of Offeror  Offeror C | | Date of Proposal  March 13, 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.  **2. Proposal Summary:**  Offeror C provided a technical approach to the VistA Integration Adapter (VIA) Enhancement optional tasks beginning with an understanding of the problem background followed by its understanding of the Performance Work Statement, an overall approach to Active State support with a graphic depiction of its Engineering Lifecycle for Solution Development and finally its approach for each of the nine new enhancements. The Offeror provided an estimated level of effort by labor category for its team and each tasks of the Performance Work Statement (PWS). The proposal described a high level approach to the management methodology and staffing that would be would be needed to complete the task along with security clearances. Lastly Offeror C provided a GANNT chart with proposed dates for beginning, ending and duration for each task.    The Offeror has proposed to team with one subcontractor.  After review of the entire proposal, it was determined that the Offeror’s approach contained the Significant Weakness and Deficiency detailed below. The remainder of the VIA Enhancements requirements was adequately addressed.  **3. Summary of Significant Strengths and Strengths:**  None  **4. Summary of Significant Weaknesses and Weaknesses:**  **Significant Weakness #1:** (TEP p 18 Section 5, Appendix A, pages A-1 – A9, Request for Task Execution Plan (RTEP) B.1.4) The Offeror does not show any User Acceptance demonstrations in the GANTT Chart. Offeror C’s proposal included High-Level Summary draft GANTT chart and a detailed GANTT chart as an appendix and neither chart included estimated start and finished dates with total task durations for each task in the PWS. The RTEP instructions clearly stat the Offeror was to provide a “complete GANTT chart indicating expected start and completion dates, for all project tasks and sub-tasks”. The User Acceptance Demonstrations is PWS task 5.3.2 and is crucial for customer acceptance of requirements developed. The omission of this task in the GANTT Chart puts the Government at risk of not being shown what is being deployed which would be unacceptable.  **5. Summary of Deficiencies**:  **Deficiency # 1** (TEP pages 5-16, Section 2.2, RTEP B.1.1, PWS 5.4) – Offeror C provides an overall approach process and methods for developing VIA and included a graphic depicting its Agile Engineering Lifecycle for Solution Development however, the majority of the tasks and most of the deliverables are not the same tasks and deliverables as laid out in the PWS. The Offeror’s approach includes providing an updated Version Description Document and signed Customer Acceptance Forms of which neither are products of the PWS. Offeror C’s Agile Engineering Lifecycles portrays VIA Active State as including Development, User Function Testing, Operational Readiness, Initial Operating Capability and Implementation (Function Operational Readiness/National Deployment). The PWS specifically states, “The Active State is composed of the Development, Initial Operating Capability and Deployment Phases”. The Offeror’s overview illustration of the VIA Enhancements project significantly decreases the Government’s confidence that the Offeror understands the tasks as described in the PWS because it deviates to far from the tasks outlined in the PWS.  Additionally, the Offeror fails to mention specific deliverables for the optional tasks in the PWS section 5.4. Each of the nine new Enhancement optional tasks requires the deliverables identified in PWS sections 5.1 through 5.3. The proposed approach for performing the optional tasks do not have any information on creation or updating the reports/documents at the increment level, which are clearly called out in the PWS for each optional task. A key deliverable for each of the development increments for each optional task is the Open Source Submission Package and this is not identified anywhere in the Offeror’s TEP. The Offeror merely makes generic statements about the Open Source Community or open source systems (pages 1 and 2). In only one of the TEP sections, 2.2.5, on page is there mention of updating the Software Design Document and none of the paragraphs mention updating the Interface Control Document which is a requirement in PWS Section 5.2.  As well, the only mentions the Configuration Management Plan briefly when it states “a configuration analyst familiar with implementing a configuration management plan”. The PWS requirement is for the Contractor to create a Configuration Management Plan which documents the Configuration Management steps, tools, and methods and ensure that a Configuration Management program is applied on all software, systems, and documentation. Offeror C’s proposed approach fails to provide any detail as to how it will complete this undertaking for each of the Enhancement tasks. Moreover, the only mention of the User Acceptance Demonstrations in provided in the Offeror’s proposed LOE in which it lists the task title and annotates that it is included with the tasks in PWS 5.4. On page 4 of Offeror C’s TEP it simply states, “The Offeror will also provide detailed test focused demos as each functional objective is completed”. The lack of mention on providing these critical documents or purely restating the requirement introduces significant doubt that the Offeror understands the requirements for VIA Enhancements and increases the risk of unsuccessful completion of the PWS.  Overall, Offeror C’s erroneous graphic depiction of its Agile Engineering Lifecycle and omission of key deliverables required under the PWS represents a deficiency of the proposal which increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. By failing to meet stated requirements and introducing inaccurate tasks and deliverables, the Offeror’s proposed approach creates an unacceptable risk to the Government with regard to its ability to provide technology solutions critical to delivering reliable, accessible and timely healthcare to Veterans.  **6. Special Terms and Conditions / Deviation / Critical Assumptions stated in TEP:**  None  **7. Evaluation Criteria:**  **a. Understanding of the Problem**  Overall the Offeror demonstrates a lack of understanding of the requirements.  **b. Feasibility of Approach**  Overall the Offeror demonstrates an approach that is cannot be expected to meet the requirements and is considered very high risk.  **8. Rating:** Unacceptable  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. | | **Technical Rating:**  Unacceptable |
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