Knowledge, Expertise and similar work examples:

**1. Strength #1** (TEP, pg. 4-5, RTEP Instructions B.1.3) The Offeror demonstrates knowledge in Genomic data analysis and has invested in internal Research and Development (R&D) for genomic data analysis. Offeror A’s internal research combined the technologies of open source algorithms, pipeline frameworks, and best practices with disciplined engineering processes and optimized a system for highly scalable and configurable Next Generation DNA Sequencing (NGS) pipelines in order to process large numbers of genomes form reads to annotated variants in less than one (1) hour in its research environment. The Offeror proposes to utilize a similar approach to undertake this effort. Internal research and lessons learned are beneficial for execution of the current GenISIS Genomic Analysis Pipeline Development (GAPD) project in that the solutions implemented would be current in today’s rapidly evolving field of genomics technology. Overall, the benefit to the Government is the Offeror’s system knowledge in the area of genomics/big data analysis which will reduce the amount of time and ramp up required to begin immediate work on the GAPD project thereby ensuring that the program will be able to meet its deadline of making genomic data available to VA researchers by FY14.

**1. Significant Strength #1** (TEP, Sec. 2.1, RTEP Instructions B.1.1): Offeror B demonstrates extensive experience and deep knowledge of the CBO Data Warehouse (DW) architecture and current Extraction, Transformation, and Loading (ETL) processes by succinctly describing the architecture and ETL processes. Additionally, the Offeror has hands-on experience with CBO's current business intelligence (BI) reporting system, using Oracle Business Intelligence Enterprise Edition (OBIEE) as the associated tool which allows them greater insight into the “as is” model. Because the Offeror is knowledgeable in OBIEE, which is currently being used in the present CBO model, the Offeror’s approach for the analysis and development of an “as is” architecture model will be much more efficient and detail aspects of the system thus otherwise unknown to those without hands on experience; allowing the Offeror to determine what the most effective BI tool for the future state “to be” model is. The Offeror’s knowledge of CBO’s current architecture and processes, coupled with its hand on experience with the current BI reporting system increases the likelihood of successful completion of the requirements for the Enterprise Architecture Assessment and Enhancement tasks, ensures minimal ramp up time to begin work and provides an approach that will capture all necessary information in order to develop the “to be” model.

**1. Strength #1 (TEP page 3, paragraph 1.2.1, RTEP Instructions B.1.5)** – The Offeror’s staffing approach includes Certified ScrumMasters who have successfully practiced Agile software development including the development of the MyHealtheVet (MHV) portal. Additionally, Offeror A’s team includes individuals with hands-on technical and clinical experience with CPRS. This expertise with the MHV portal and CPRS is directly applicable to understanding the requirements for integration with and implementing the e-Screening application with the MHV portal, as described in PWS section 5.7 and specified in Attachment A of the PWS. The overall benefit to the Government is that Offeror A‘s expertise and system knowledge decreases the amount of time needed for ramp up and completion of all of the required PWS tasks.

**5. Strength #5** (TEP page 2, RTEP Instructions B.1.3): The Offeror possesses thorough knowledge of the Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) process and working environment. Offeror C shows an understanding that the Privacy Service Database must classify data in a way that leverages an understanding of not only PIAs, but also the process of completing and reviewing a PIA before it is accepted. In addition to incorporating compliance with VA privacy standards, the database must be organized and developed according to general database best practices and utilize key technologies such as Microsoft Access, Visual Basic, Access Macros, and Structured Query Language (SQL). An extensive understanding of the information that feeds into a PIA submission is essential. This information includes, but is not limited to, System of Record Notices (SORNs), System Security Plans (SSPs), and VA forms. Offeror C shows an understanding of the requirements for the Office of Privacy and Records Management (OPRM) business processes as well as the requirements for PIA submission. The Offeror’s knowledge of VA processes coupled with its expertise and approach in all required aspects of database migration increases the likelihood of success for the Data Validation project.

Management Methodology examples (these typically are only strengths, it is difficult to do SS:

**4. Strength #4** (TEP exhibits 2, 3, 10 and 14, RTEP Instructions B.1.3) The proposal details a sound project management approach that integrates the development of a Contractor Project Management Plan (CPMP) with frequent performance monitoring and reporting. This proposed project management approach which includes iterative reporting and interim progress evaluation provides for the Government and/or the contractor to find and fix/manage issues that hinder the successful execution of the project in a timely manner. This approach of risk mitigation by not waiting to the very end to determine success or failure of the project will greatly benefit the Government to allow time for corrective measures to be implemented. Offeror B provided a detailed overview of its approach to GenISIS GAPD project which clearly defines each stage from conducting the environmental scan through design and implementation strategy and finally with tool development and implementation. Additionally the Offeror concisely detailed its Agile Software Development Life Cycle (SDLC). Within an Agile SDLC approach each development increment is defined as sprints and the Offeror proposes that within each sprint, all SDLC members will meet on a daily basis to ensure continuous communication and information flow. The proposed approach thus greatly lowers the risk that milestones will be missed and increases the changes that project delivery will be on or even ahead of schedule.

**Strength #4** (TEP p. 23, Section 3.0, RTEP B.1.3) The Offeror proposes a management methodology, staffing and onboarding approach that will leverage existing staff that have existing Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) access and clearance, which will provide flexibility to respond to project requirements and mitigate on-boarding timelines immediately upon contract award. The Offeror describes its resource management approach with particular attention to providing resources with security clearances and Personal Identity Verification (PIV) cards to the project. Obtaining the required security clearances and PIV cards can be a lengthy process and Offeror A’s approach eliminates this process, reduces ramp up speed and enables it to commence work immediately after award. Overall, the Offeror proposes a management approach that will ensure minimal ramp up time to begin work, decrease probability of having poor or uninformed schedule estimates, and decrease the risk of schedule slips and inconsistent processes.

Testing examples:

**Significant Strength** #2 – (TEP p.17 - 20, Section 2.2.1, RTEP B.1.2) The Offeror describes a rigorous planning, script development, and implementation approach to defect testing, inclusive of unit, functional, system and integration tests. Offeror A’s approach to Development Test Support focuses on validating the requirements and defect fixes identified with bundled builds for immunization packages. The Offeror’s approach includes a dynamic and collaborative approach to testing which engages technical staff throughout the testing cycle. This approach enables early identification of discrepancies and demonstrates an ability to produce faster development solutions. The Offeror details its testing strategy utilizing a Test Matrix that maps the Use Case/Test Scenarios against the features affected by changes, thus ensuring that all VIMM 2.0 requirements are thoroughly tested in alignment to the business process (i.e., use case) in which they will be performed once in production. This mapping serves to validate the feasibility and usability of the solution prior to implementation, which provides VA significant value and demonstrates proper due diligence. The Offeror’s Use case testing approach utilizes a technique that exercises the whole system on a transaction by transaction basis from start to finish. As a result, the Offeror’s use case testing approach facilitates comprehensive testing of the end-to-end immunization system to uncover and resolve defects before the system is deployed to production, which benefits the VA end user with a more stable system when deployed. Overall, the Offeror demonstrates an approach to testing that aligns to VA best practices and details the activities necessary to produce the necessary testing artifacts. This understanding is critical to the effective delivery of a defect-free Immunization 2.0 product.

**Strength #3** (TEP pg. 14-22, paragraph Sections 2.3 including subsections 2.3.1, RTEP, B.1.2) Offeror C’s approach for Development Test Support includes a graphical depiction of its testing methodology to uncover potential system deficiencies and provide a basis for its elimination. The Offeror also describes its lifecycle testing approach, which begins with planning and culminates in Acceptance & Baseline testing and aligns with VA’s ProPath processes. The Offeror proposes to test specific, higher risk functionality components (i.e., new features, interoperability, and user interface) which warrant prioritization in the testing cycles so as to identify anomalies early and execute risk mitigation strategies as they align to prioritized end user business process priorities. In addition, the Offeror proposes to automate testing procedures. The Offeror’s proposed automation approach, coupled with a well-defined risk-based test management process, provides a feasible technical approach to conducting testing. Automated testing facilitates repeatability, speeds time required for regression testing each time new code is delivered (to validate that new code doesn’t break previously-delivered code), and is not subject to human error, thus decreasing test planning and execution time. As a result, the automated testing will provide test code re-usability and cost savings to VA when the program moves into Sustainment at the beginning of FY17, as all relevant and technically feasible test cases will be automated by the end of the task order period.