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| **T4 TECHNICAL EVALUATION FORM – FIRM FIXED PRICE & TIME-AND-MATERIALS** | | |
| T4 Number  T4-0250 | Task Title  VistA Adaptive Maintenance | |
| Name of Offeror  Offeror A | | Date of Proposal  August 17, 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:**  **Example:**  The Offeror provided a technical and management approach to conducting application development, modernization, and operations and maintenance (O&M) activities using the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Agile Framework.  The Offeror’s response described the technical and management solution to the problem identified in the Performance Work Statement (PWS). The proposal describes how the Offeror will implement a common services framework, implement Agile processes compliant with the CBP Agile Framework, and provide opportunities to leverage their corporate expertise by providing the Government access to annual innovation workshops and senior technical subject matter experts at no direct cost to the Government. The response also includes a discussion on the Offeror’s approach to management processes to advance the Cargo Systems Program Office’s (CSPO) objectives. Finally, the proposal outlines the staffing levels by labor category and also the project staffing resource experience and qualification.  The Offeror has proposed to team with X subcontractors.  After review of the entire proposal, it was determined that the Offeror’s approach contained [*the Strengths, Weaknesses, and/or Deficiencies*] detailed below. The remainder of the Financial Management Transformation Service (FMTS) Program Planning, Management and Support (PPMS) requirements was adequately addressed.  **3. Summary of Significant Strengths and Strengths:**  ***Please review the definition of a SS & S as identified in the Evaluation Plan.***  **Example:**  **Significant Strength #1:** (TEP pp 5-6, Request for Task Execution Plan (RTEP) B.1.1, PWS 5.3) (TEP p.11, Section 3.2.2.3, RTEP Instructions B.1.1): The Offeror provides a highly detailed explanation of its approach for executing and delivering reconciliation reports including how to address common complexities in reconciliation. (**What is proposed**) Reconciliation of actuals is by far the most complex and difficult task encountered in planning/scheduling, and an area where most projects and planners struggle the most, take long periods of time to complete, and often still end up with incomplete and/or unreliable results. (**WHY this is important**) Offeror A proposes an approach which demonstrates an understanding of how reconciliation is inseparably dependent on the Primavera timesheets to collecting actuals. The Offeror addresses this dependency by providing a highly automated, reliable and repeatable process that expedites the reconciliation process through the use of a phased approach using various steps to capture the point at which different labor cost data is posted and non-labor expenses are entered into Primavera. Offeror A’s approach shows an understanding of the real challenges involved in reconciliation that exist because of indirect integration of VA finance systems with Primavera. (**HOW this approach benefits the G’vt**) Offeror A’s approach and expertise with actuals reconciliation will significantly reduce the risk of schedule delay, inaccurate costing, underestimation of the effort needed for reconciliation tasks and decrease the amount of rework; all of which strongly increases the confidence in the Offeror’s ability to deliver the requirements of the PWS. **(IMPACT Statement)**  **Significant Strength #2:** (TEP pp X, RTEP B.1.X, PWS 5.X) ………  **Strength #3:** (TEP p X, RTEP B.1.X, PWS 5.X) ………..  **4. Summary of Significant Weaknesses and Weaknesses:**  ***Please review the definition of a SW & W as identified in the Evaluation Plan.***  **Example:**  **Weakness #1** (TEP p7 Section 3.1, RTEP Instructions B.1.1): The Offeror demonstrated a lack of understanding of the complex factors in reconciliation reports. **(WHAT is proposed)** The Offeror provided minimal detail regarding its approach to actuals reconciliation that the Government cannot determine if the Offeror fully understands all of the steps and challenges involved in the process, such as relationship to timesheets, distributing actuals from program level contracts to increments, allocation of nonproject time/nonwork time (NPT/NWT), steps in Primavera to allow reconciliation to work not only at the project level, but at an increment level, especially for contracts with invoices that do not list increments. Actuals reconciliation is by far the most complex and difficult task encountered in planning/scheduling. It is an area where most projects and planners struggle the most, it take long times to complete, is very time consuming, and often ends up with incomplete or unreliable results. **(WHY this is a weakness)** The lack of a detailed approach increases risk of inaccuracies or delayed completion and increases the risk of unsuccessful completion of all the required tasks of the PWS. (**IMPACT)** Statement)  **5. Summary of Deficiencies**:  ***Please review the definition of a Deficiency as identified in the Evaluation Plan.***  **Example:**  **Deficiency #1** - (TEP pg. 7, RTEP Instructions B.1.2) The Offeror proposes to use a National Agency Check with Written Inquiries (NACI) background check for tasks 5.1 and 5.3 however, the PWS calls for a Moderate background Investigation (MBI) for all tasks. **(WHAT the deficiency is)** The Management Methodology proposed by the Offeror does not meet the position sensitivity and background investigation requirements listed in the PWS for this effort, thereby increasing the risk of unsuccessful task order performance to an unacceptable level. **(WHY this is a deficiency)** This can also introduce the potential that the Offeror will propose staff that will not pass an MBI background check, causing delays in staffing and contract performance. **(IMPACT)**  **6. Special Terms and Conditions / Deviation / Critical Assumptions stated in TEP:**  **7. Evaluation Criteria:**  **a. Understanding of the Problem**  Overall the Offeror demonstrates a X understanding of the requirements.  **b. Feasibility of Approach**  Overall the Offeror demonstrates an approach that is considered X feasible and is considered X risk.  **8. Rating:**  Outstanding, Good, Acceptable, Susceptible to Being Acceptable or Unacceptable. ***[Derived from Evaluation Plan Definitions]***  **Simply provide the definition of the rating from the Evaluation Plan.**  **Example:**    **Rating: Acceptable -** A TEP that at least meets all of the Government’s requirements, demonstrates at least a minimal understanding of the problems and is at least minimally feasible (moderate to high risk). | | **Technical Rating:**  Outstanding  Good  Acceptable  Susceptible to Being Made Acceptable  Unacceptable |
|  | |  |
| **Evaluator Signature**  *Only one signature should be provided even if multiple technical evaluators participated. The lead technical evaluator should sign and date the technical reports.* | | **Date** |
|  | | |
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