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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:**  The Offeror provided a technical and management approach to conducting Agile Planning through Release and Deployment Support by applying a Veteran-Focused Integration Process (VIP)-Centric Scrum implementation of Agile methodology and use Test-Driven Development (TDD) in conjunction with it.  The Offeror’s response described its technical and management approach to the problem identified in the Performance Work Statement (PWS). The proposal describes how the Offeror would implement an “integrated micro-services architecture to compartmentalize common web services functionalities”. This “micro-services architecture” consists of modification of current production VistA MUMPS and CPRS Delphi code, and addition of an Entity File to the VistA FileMan database, which is in turn wrapped as “micro- services”.  The Offeror’s response also described a means by which they intend to provide automated testing. Finally, the Offeror’s response outlines the staffing level of effort (LOE) by labor category and also the proposed role of the staffing resource.  The Offeror has proposed to team with three (3) subcontractors.  After review of the entire proposal, it was determined that the Offeror’s approach contained the Weaknesses and Deficiencies detailed below. The remainder of the VistA Adaptive requirements was adequately addressed.  **3. Summary of Significant Strengths and Strengths:**  None  **4. Summary of Significant Weaknesses and Weaknesses:**  **Significant Weakness #1** (TEP p8, Section 2.1, RTEP Instruction D.1.g): The Offeror demonstrated a lack of understanding of the required final solution as explicitly stated in PWS Section 1.0, Background, and as further emphasized in RTEP Instruction D.1.g, which states that the “final solution has no legacy MUMPS dependencies.”  Instead, the Offeror proposed an approach that enhances and enforces legacy VistA MUMPS dependencies by adding an “Entity File” to the FileMan database, and then wrapping this MUMPS functionality as their “micro-services” solution.  This enlargement and enforcement of the legacy MUMPS infrastructure (rather than emulation using Javascript/Node.js as specified) creates only an increased dependency on the legacy VistA MUMPS stack, making it less possible to migrate off of the legacy MUMPS code.  The lack of understanding of the VA’s requirements for the emulation (not encapsulation or “wrapping”) of VA patient data entry (PDE) and Pharmacy Computerized Physician Entry (CPOE) functionality forces VA’s continued dependency on legacy MUMPS code and infrastructure as opposed to decreasing these dependencies.  The failure to emulate the PDE and CPOE functionality and instead enforcing reliance on VistA MUMPS fails the most important criteria of the final solution in being legacy MUMPS-independent. (**IMPACT)** Statement)  This forces VA to maintain its legacy MUMPS code and infrastructure in perpetuity, and prevents migration to a modern cloud-based, commercial Electronic Health Record (EHR).  **5. Summary of Deficiencies**:  **Significant Deficiency #1**  As stated above.  Significant Deficiency #2  Lack of node.js-based central services  There is no mention of this in their final solution.  Significant Deficiency #3  Per the PWS requirement, CPRS shall run as is with no change over the VICS (i.e. there shall be no change in the Delphi code of CPRS).  However, the offeror’s solution required changes in the CPRS client for its solution to work. There was an entire section (Section 11) dedicated to the changes in the CPRS Delphi code.  **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 most essential of the requirements for the final solution.  **b. Feasibility of Approach**  Overall the Offeror demonstrates an approach that is considered X feasible and is considered X risk.  **8. Rating:**  Unacceptable - A TEP that contains a major error(s), omission(s) or deficiency(ies) that indicates a lack of understanding of the problems or an approach that cannot be expected to meet requirements or involves a very high risk; and none of these conditions can be corrected without a major rewrite or revision of the TEP. | | **Technical Rating:**  **Unacceptable** |
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| **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** |
| **Rafael M. Richards [Please elaborate your title here]** | | |
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