| SCORING METHODOLOGY* | | | | |
|----------------------|----------|--|--|--|
| Max Points | 105 | | | |
| Exceptional | 90 - 105 | | | |
| Acceptable/Marginal | 79 - 89 | | | |
| Unacceptable | 0 - 78 | | | |

| Agile 6 | 93 |
|----------------------------|----|
| DH Synergetech | 92 |
| HOTB Software | 82 |
| Infiniti Consulting | 91 |
| PwC Public Sector | 68 |
| QualApps, Inc. | 95 |
| Stanfield Systems | 71 |
| The iFish Group | 95 |
| VIP | 95 |
| West Advanced Technologies | 81 |
| xFusion Technologies | 98 |

| 105 = A+ |
|--------------|
| 100 = A |
| 95 = A- |
| 90 = B+ |
| 85 = B |
| 80 = B- |
| 75 = C+ |
| 70 = C |
| 65 = C- |
| 0 - 64 = D/F |
| |

^{*}As with prior refreshes, only companies with scores in the "Exceptional" range are selected to be included in the pool.

AGILE SIX APPLICATIONS, INC.

The criteria below will be used to pick Bidders for the Pre-Screen Award. A large part of the screening will be ensuring the working prototype matches the description in the GitHub repository, and vice versa.

GitHub Repository Site: https://github.com/agilesix/ADPQ Location of Accounts to Login to the Prototype: https://github.com/agilesix/ADPQ/wiki

Prototype Location: https://a2.agile6.com

| | ADMIN REVIEW | | | |
|----|--|--|----------------|----------|
| | Review Item | Possible Score | Assessed Score | Comments |
| | Is the code and other documentation available in a GitHub repository? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| | Has the GitHub repository been submitted on time, with no changes after the due date? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| | Is a working prototype available (no 4xx or 5xx errors) in a public location specified in the README.md? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| 4 | Does the Vendor submitting the response have a verifiable history of delivering working software? | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 | 0 | |
| | | Very Intuitive = 15 | | |
| 5 | Is the user interface intuitive? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | 15 | |
| - | to the dest matter. | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | 10 | |
| | | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| | | Very Easy = 15 | | |
| 6 | Is the user interface easy to use? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | 15 | |
| - | to the deed internal deed to deed. | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | 10 | |
| | | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| | TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW | Admin Review Score: | 30 | |
| 7 | Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words? | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 | 5 | |
| | Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words? Does the description make reference to the US Digital Services playbook in their response? (see https://olavbook.cio.gov) | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description make reterence to the US Digital Services playbook in their response? (see https://piaybook.or.oi.o.dov) Does the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the quality of the prototype submitted? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description make reference to a team that includes, at a minimum, five (5) of the labor categories as identified in the RFI? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description inflave retrievable to a team that includes, at a minimum, inversity of the radio categories as identified in the KFT? Does the description reference human centered design techniques/tools? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the protype reflect the use of the tools and is it consistent with the description, as best as you can tell? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description reference a design style quide and/or pattern library? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the prototype reflect the use of design style guide and/or pattern library and is it consistent with the description? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side we technologies? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the prototype reflect the use of at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies and is the use consistent with the description? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description make reference to performing usability tests with people? | Yes = 2 pts: No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description make reference to using an iterative approach, where feedback informed and influenced subsequent work? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| • | | Technical Review Score: | 27 | |
| | WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW | | | |
| | Does the Working Prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (KAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of centent, including documents, user-configurable forms, tables, and workflows. | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | Does the Working Prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formats of information in KAs (e.g., bullet points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for junior/non-technical staff)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 21 | Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow controll of access and level of information by login? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 23 | Does the Working Prototype have the ability to create user-defined rules for creation (e.g., mandatory fields) and lifecycle management (e.g., who, how, when revised and updated)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | Does the Working Prototype trigger escalation processes (e.g., automated emails/texts to approers, reminders) for lifecycle activities? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | Does the Working Prototype have the aiblity to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new records or record types? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning form existing records (e.g., typesw, content, usage) and prompting to create new KAs? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 0 | |
| 27 | Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 0 | |
| | PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW | orking Prototype Review Score: | 7 | |
| 20 | | | 0 | |
| | Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 29 | Code Climate Score | > 3.5 = 10 pts < 3.5 = 0 pts | 10 | |
| 30 | Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (faas) or Platform as Service (Paas) provider, and indicate which provider they used? | Yes = 2 pts: No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description reference the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 31 | and description relations and diseasers of affect that the treatment and the treatment and treatment | > 85% = 5 pts | - | |
| | | > 75% = 3 pts | | |
| 32 | Code Coverage | > 65% = 1 pt | 1 | |
| | | < 64.9% = 0 pts | | |
| 33 | Does the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. oit, GitHub swr) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description of continuous monitoring? Does the description reference continuous monitoring? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description and including the management of the managemen | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | | ode Examination/Review Score: | 29 | |
| | | OVERALL SCORE: | 93 | |

DH SYNERGETECH CONSULTING

The criteria below will be used to pick Bidders for the Pre-Screen Award. A large part of the screening will be ensuring the working prototype matches the description in the GitHub repository, and vice versa.

GitHub Repository Site: https://github.com/dhsynergetech/kmt.
Prototype Location: https://dhsknowledgemanagement.cfapps.io

| | ADMIN REVIEW | | | |
|-----------------|---|--------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| | Review Item | Possible Score | Assessed Score | Comments |
| l Is | the code and other documentation available in a GitHub repository? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| 2 Ha | as the GitHub repository been submitted on time, with no changes after the due date? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| Is | a working prototype available (no 4xx or 5xx errors) in a public location specified in the README.md? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| Do | oes the Vendor submitting the response have a verifiable history of delivering working software? | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 | 5 | |
| | | Very Intuitive = 15 | | |
| 5 Is | the user interface intuitive? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | 10 | |
| 5 15 | the user interacts intuitive: | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | 10 | |
| | | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| | | Very Easy = 15 | | |
| 6 Is | the user interface easy to use? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | 15 | |
| 0 15 | the user interacte easy to use? | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | 13 | |
| | | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| | | Admin Review Score: | 30 | |
| | TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW | | | |
| ⁷ Is | the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words? | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 | 5 | |
| B Do | oes the description make reference to the US Digital Services playbook in their response? (see https://playbook.cio.gov) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | oes the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the quality of the prototype submitted? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | oes the description make reference to a team that includes, at a minimum, five (5) of the labor categories as identified in the RFI? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | oes the description reference human centered design techniques/tools? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | oes the prototype reflect the use of the tools and is it consistent with the description, as best as you can tell? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | oes the description reference a design style guide and/or pattern library? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 4 Do | oes the prototype reflect the use of design style guide and/or pattern library and is it consistent with the description? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | oes the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | oes the prototype reflect the use of at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies and is the use consistent with the description? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | oes the description make reference to performing usability tests with people? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 8 D | oes the description make reference to using an iterative approach, where feedback informed and influenced subsequent work? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 0 | |
| | | Technical Review Score: | 25 | |
| | WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW | | | |
| | oes the Working Prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (KAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of centent, including documents, user- | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | onfigurable forms, tables, and workflows. | 1 | 1 | |
| | oes the Working Prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formats of information in KAs (e.g., bullet points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for junior/non-technical staff)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | | |
| | oes the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow controll of access and level of information by login? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | oes the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | oes the Working Prototype have the ability to create user-defined rules for creation (e.g., mandatory fields) and lifecycle management (e.g., who, how, when revised and updated)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | oes the Working Prototype trigger escalation processes (e.g., automated emails/texts to approers, reminders) for lifecycle activities? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | oes the Working Prototype have the aiblity to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new records or record types? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | oes the Working Prototype show innovation by learning form existing records (e.g., typesw, content, usage) and prompting to create new KAs? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 7 D | oes the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 0 | |
| | | orking Prototype Review Score: | 8 | |
| - 1 | PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW | | | |
| 28 Is | there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 9 C | ode Climate Score | > 3.5 = 10 pts | 10 | |
| | | < 3.5 = 0 pts | | |
| | oes the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platform as Service (Paas) provider, and indicate which provider they used? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 1 Do | oes the description reference the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | | > 85% = 5 pts | | |
| 2 C | ode Coverage | > 75% = 3 pts | 1 | |
| 100 | | > 65% = 1 pt | | |
| | | < 64.9% = 0 pts | | |
| | oes the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | oes the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. qit, GitHub,svn) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | oes the description reference continuous monitoring? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | oes the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | oes the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 8 Ar | re the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Co | de Examination/Review Score: | 29 | |
| | | OVERALL SCORE: | 92 | |

HOMEOWNER TOOLBOX (HOTB) SOFTWARE SOLUTIONS

The criteria below will be used to pick Bidders for the Pre-Screen Award. A large part of the screening will be ensuring the working prototype matches the description in the GitHub repository, and vice versa.

GitHub Repsoitory Site: https://github.com/HOTB-Software/adpq-2018/tree/master Prototype Location:

ADPQ-Credentials - Config Files: 15DBBB41.zip

| Is the code and offer documentation availabile in a Circle frequency of the transport of the code and offer documentation availabile in the code and offer documentation and offer and off | | ADMIN REVIEW | | | |
|--|----|--|-------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Pass | | Review Item | Possible Score | Assessed Score | Comments |
| Sea anothing proteining are interaction to desire of the control proteining the response have a verification in the REFADRE mil! Please Pleas | 1 | Is the code and other documentation available in a GitHub repository? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| Does the Verdor's Individual Processing Pr | 2 | Has the GitHub repository been submitted on time, with no changes after the due date? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| Is the user interface intailities? Is the user interface easy to use? It is the user interface easy to use? TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW APPROA | 3 | Is a working prototype available (no 4xx or 5xx errors) in a public location specified in the README.md? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| Is the user interface intailities? Is the user interface easy to use? It is the user interface easy to use? TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW APPROA | 4 | Does the Vendor submitting the response have a verifiable history of delivering working software? | Yes = 5 pts: No = 0 | 0 | |
| Is the user interface only to use? It is the user interface only to use? TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW THE DITIGIT IS 1 Somewhat Easy 1 to Somewhat Difficult is 3 THE DITIGIT IS 1 THE DITIGI | | | | | |
| Is the user interface only to use? It is the user interface only to use? TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW THE DITIGIT IS 1 Somewhat Easy 1 to Somewhat Difficult is 3 THE DITIGIT IS 1 THE DITIGI | _ | | Somewhat Fasy = 10 | | |
| Is the user interface easy to use? Set user interface easy to use? Set user interface easy to use? Set user interface easy to use? Set user interface easy to use? Set user interface easy to use? Set user interface easy to use? Set user interface easy to use? Set user interface easy to use? Set user interface easy to use? Set user interface easy to use? Set user interface easy to use? Set user interface easy to user? Set user interface easy to user? Set user interface easy to us | 5 | Is the user interface intuitive? | | 10 | |
| Is the user interface easy to use? Secondary Technical Approach Nerrative under 200 sectors? Secondary Technical Approach Nerrative under 200 sectors under 2 | | | | | |
| be the user interface easy to use? TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW Associated to the control of the | | | | | |
| Somewhat Difficult = 5 Wey Difficult = 5 Admin Review Score Admin Review Score Admin Review Score TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW Technical Approach Name reference to the US Dispas Services playdood in their response? Teach History Science Score Technical Approach Name reference to the US Dispas Services playdood in their response? Teach History Science Score Technical Approach Name reference to the US Dispas Services playdood in their response? Teach History Science Scie | | | | | |
| TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW REVIEW REVIEW TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW REV | 6 | Is the user interface easy to use? | | 10 | |
| TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW REVIEW TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW REVIE | | | | | |
| TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW Yes = 5 pils; No - 0 | | | | 20 | |
| Is the Verdor's Ted-mical Approach Narrathee under 2:000 words? Obes the description make reference to be this CP-0018 words of the control of the county of t | | TECHNICAL ADDROACH DEVIEW | Admin Review Score: | 20 | |
| Does the description make reference to the U.S. Distalt Services playbook in their responsibility for each possible description make reference to the U.S. Distalt Services playbook in their responsibility for the each possible responsibility for each possible responsibility for the each possible responsibility for the each possible responsibility for the each possible responsibility for each possible responsibility for the each possible responsibility | 7 | | Voc - 5 ptc: No - 0 | E | |
| Does the description make reference to a sinule leader with the responsibility for the southly of the prototype submitted? Does the description make reference to a sinule leader with the responsibility for the southly of the south | 8 | | | | |
| Does the description make inference to a factor that includes, at a minimum, five (s) of the labor categories as identified in the REF? Does the description reference have careful design before the use of the social and it consistent with the description. as beet as vou can tet? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Does the becompton reference have given be used in a consistent with the description? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Does the protection reference at least five (i) modern and open source formed and open source formed and open source formed or client ask what technologies? Does the description reference at least five (i) modern and open source formed or client ask what technologies? Does the description reference at least five (ii) modern and open source formed or client ask what technologies? Does the description reference at least five (ii) modern and open source formed or client ask what technologies? Does the description make reference to use and technologies and in the use consistent with the description? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Does the description make reference to use and technologies? WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW Technologies of centers, including documents, user-confidence or confidence or confide | 9 | | | | |
| Does the description reference human centered design technographic holds? Does the prototype reflect the use of the bools and is in consistent with the description, as best as you can tell? Does the description reference a design style guide and/or pattern library? (Yes = 2 bits; No = 0 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | 10 | | | | |
| Does the protectives reflect the use of the tools and is all consistent with the description reference a feety parter library? Does the protective reflects at feety parter library? Yes = 2 pits; No = 0 2 Does the protective reflects at feety parter library? Yes = 2 pits; No = 0 2 Does the description reflects at feet the size of all thesis five (3) modern and open source forwards or clients side web technologies? Yes = 2 pits; No = 0 2 Does the description make reflects the size of all thesis five (3) modern and open source forwards or clients side web technologies and is the use consistent with the description? WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW Technical Review Score: 25 WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW Does the Working Prototype have the ability to esaily create "increasing parter library" (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and open accounts. user confluenced subsequent work? Does the Working Prototype have the ability to condemnate the size of | 11 | | | | |
| Does the description reference a design style guide and/or pattern library? Does the protription reference at least five (5) modern and open source fromtend or client side web technologies? Yes = 2 pits, No = 0 Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source fromtend or client side web technologies? Yes = 2 pits, No = 0 2 Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source fromtend or client side web technologies? Yes = 2 pits, No = 0 2 Does the description make reference to be reforming usability tests with people? Yes = 2 pits, No = 0 2 Does the description make reference to bertoming usability tests with people? Working Prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (K4s)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or contret) and/or parkages of centent, including documents, user's coordinate forms, tables, and workflows. Does the Working Prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formats of information in K4s (e.g., builet points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for luminor/mort-echnical staff!? Yes = 1 pits, No = 0 1 Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow control of access and level of information in K4s (e.g., builet points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for luminor/mort-echnical staff!? Yes = 1 pits, No = 0 Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow control of access and level of information by login? Yes = 1 pits, No = 0 Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow control of access and level of information in pit (e.g., who, low, when revised and updated?) Yes = 1 pits, No = 0 Does the Working Prototype lave the ability to provide multiple levels and channels, as required? Yes = 1 pits, No = 0 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and channels, as required? Yes = 1 pits, No = 0 Does the Working Prototype hav | 12 | | | | |
| Does the prototype reflect the use of design style guide another patterns brave and is it consistent with the description? Does the description reference a less tift (6) modern and open source frontend or client side whe technologies and is the use consistent with the description? Yes = 2 pts, No = 0 2 Does the prototype reflect the use of at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies and is the use consistent with the description? Yes = 2 pts, No = 0 2 Does the description make reference to be performing substity lests with people? Does the description make reference to be performed and influenced subsequent work? WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW Technical Review Score: WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW Does the Working Prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (KAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of centent, including documents, user- configurable from; tables, and workfollows. Does the Working Prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formats of information in KAs (e.g., builter points for senior technical levils, and the prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formats of information in KAs (e.g., builter points for senior technical levils, and the prototype and the provide description and the prototype and the ability to provide multiple levels and formats or information in KAs (e.g., builter points for senior technical levils, and the prototype and the provide prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formats or information in KAs (e.g., builter points for senior technical levils, and the prototype and understandable? PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW P | 13 | | | | |
| Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies and is the use consistent with the description? Does the description make reference to performing usability tests with people? Does the description make reference to be performing usability tests with people? Wes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Does the description make reference to burnan nate resistance by the people of the peopl | 14 | | | | |
| Does the cortotype reflect the use of at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies and is the use consistent with the description? Ves. 2 pts; No. 0 2 Does the description make reference to performing usebality tests with people? Ves. 2 pts; No. 0 2 Does the description make reference to using an iterative approach, where feedback informed and influenced subsequent work? WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW Does the Working Prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (KAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of certent, including documents, user configurable forms, tables, and workflows. Does the Working Prototype have the ability to result or content and the prototype through the service of the content of the prototype and the prototype | 15 | Does the prototype reject the use or design style quide and/or pattern library and is it consistent with the description? | | | |
| Does the description make reference to performing usability tests with people? Does the description make reference to using an iterative approach, where feedback informed and influenced subsequent work? WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW Does the Working Prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (KAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of certent, including documents, user confluence in the prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formats of information in KAs (e.g., bullet points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for juniorinon-technical staff)? Does the Working Prototype allow for rice-based security access, to allow control of access and level of information by login? Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information access, so allow control of access and level of information by login? Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information access, so allow control of access and level of information by login? Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information access, so allow control of access and level of information by login? Does the Working Prototype allow for the based security access, to allow control of access and level of information by login? Yes = 1 pts, No = 0 1 Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information access systems and charmels, as required? Yes = 1 pts, No = 0 1 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to create user defined under foreration (e.g., who, low, when revised and updated)? Yes = 1 pts, No = 0 1 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to update and immove KAs and access the value of usable and immove KAs and access the value of usable and immove KAs and access the value of usable and immove KAs and access the value of usable and immove KAs and access the value of usable and immove KAs and access the value of usable and immove KAs and access | 16 | | | | |
| Does the Vorking Prototype have the ability to easily create 'knowledge articles' (Ka)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of centent, including documents, user- configurable forms, tables, and workflows. Does the Working Prototype have the ability to easily create 'knowledge articles' (Ka)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of centent, including documents, user- configurable forms, tables, and workflows. Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow control of access and level of information in KAs (e.g., buller points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for junior/non-technical staff)? Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow control of access and level of information but to severate the prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow control of access and level of information but to severate the prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow control of access and level of information but to severate the prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow control of access and level of information but to severate the prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow control of access and level of information in KAs (e.g., but levels, scripted security of the prototype access and level of information in KAs (e.g., but levels, scripted security of information in Kas (e.g., but levels, scripted security of information in Kas (e.g., but levels, sc | 17 | | | | |
| WORKING Prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (KAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of centent, including documents, user-configurable forms, tables, and workflows. Does the Working Prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formation in KAs (e.g., bullet points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for lunior/non-technical staff!? Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 1 Does the Working Prototype allow for rice beased sourty access, so, allow control of access and level of information by logh? Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? Does the Working Prototype inform Prototype have the ability to care late user-defined runles for creation (e.g., manidatory fields) and lifecycle analysement (e.g., who, how, when revised and updated)? Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 1 Does the Working Prototype inform Prototype have the ability to care late user-defined runles for creation (e.g., analyses) and promoting for lifecycle activities? Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 1 Does the Working Prototype inform Prototype have the ability to care late user-defined runles for creation (e.g., who, how, when revised and updated)? Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 1 Does the Working Prototype inform Prototype have the ability to care late user-defined runles for creation for the prototype information and prototype information and prototype information and prototype information and prototype information prototype information prototype information and prototype information protot | | | | | |
| WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW Does the Working Prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (KAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of centent, including documents, user conflourable forms, tables, and workflows. Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow control of access and level of information in KAs (e.g., bullet points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for junior/non-technical staff!? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow control of access and level of information by login? Does the Working Prototype have the ability to create user-defined rules for creation (e.g., mandatory fields) and lifecycle management (e.g., who, how, when revised and updated)? Does the Working Prototype have the ability to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new records or record types? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 1 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new records or record types? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? Ves = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an infrastructure as a Service (lass) or Platform as Service (Pass) provider, and indicate which provider they used? Ves = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an infrastructure as a Service (lass) or Platform as Service (Pass) provider, and indicate which provider they used? Ves = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an infrastructure as a Service (lass) or Platform as Service (Pass) provider, and indicate which provider they used? Ves = 2 pts; No = 0 | 10 | Loes the description make reference to using an iterative approach, where recoback informed and influenced subsequent work? | | | |
| Does the Working Prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (KAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of centent, including documents, user-conflourable forms, stables, and workflows. Does the Working Prototype allow for rich beased security access, a collevo of information by the original prototype and understandable? Does the Working Prototype allow for rich beased security access, a collevo of information by the original records (e.g., supplementation) and the prototype and understandable? Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? Does the Working Prototype and understandable or the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? Does the Working Prototype include and information across systems and channels, as required? Does the Working Prototype include and information across systems and channels, as required? Does the Working Prototype include and information across systems and channels, as required? Does the Working Prototype include and understandable? Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 Does the Working Prototype include and information across systems and channels, as required? Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 Does the Working Prototype and understandable? Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 Does the Working Prototype and understandable? Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Zobe the descrip | | WODE/INC PROTOTYPE REVIEW | recriffical Review Score: | 25 | |
| configurable forms, tables, and workflows. Dest the Working Prototype dave the ability to provide multiple levels and formation in KAs (e.g., builet points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for junior/non-technical staff)? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 Dest the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow control of access and level of information by login? Dest the Working Prototype laws the ability to create user-defined nules for creation (e.g., mandatory fields) and lifecycle management (e.g., who, how, when revised and updated)? Dest the Working Prototype have the ability to create user-defined nules for creation (e.g., mandatory fields) and lifecycle management (e.g., who, how, when revised and updated)? Dest the Working Prototype have the ability to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to prediction new records or record types? Dest the Working Prototype have the ability to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to prediction new records or record types? Dest the Working Prototype have the ability to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to prediction new records or record types? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 Dest the Working Prototype have the ability to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to prediction new records or record types? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 Dest the Working Prototype have the ability to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to prediction new records or record types? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 Dest the Working Prototype have the ability to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to prediction new records or record types? Ves = 2 pts; No = 0 Ves = 2 pts; No = 0 Dest the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (lass) or Platform as Service (Pass) provider, and indicate which provider they used? Ves = 2 pts; No = 0 Set the description reference deploying the prot | | | T | | |
| Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow control of access and level of information by login? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 1 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to create user-defined rules for creation (e.g., mandatory fields) and channels, as required? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 1 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to create user-defined rules for creation (e.g., mandatory fields) and channels, as required? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 1 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new records or record types? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 1 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new records or record types? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 1 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new records or record types? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 1 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new records or record types? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 1 Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 2 Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 2 Ves = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Ves = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Ves = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (Paas) provider, and indicate which provider they used? Ves = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Set the description reference the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable? Ves = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Set the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? Ves = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., uithind, swr) Ves = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Does the d | 19 | | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? Does the Working Prototype latow for the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? Does the Working Prototype insper escalation processes (e.g., automated emailsfeats to approes, reminders) for lifecycle activities? Does the Working Prototype insper escalation processes (e.g., automated emailsfeats to approes, reminders) for lifecycle activities? Does the Working Prototype have the ability to uddate and improve KAs and access the value of usage as inout to predicting new records or record types? Does the Working Prototype have the ability to uddate and improve KAs and access the value of usage as inout to predicting new records or record types? Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Code Climate Score Code Climate Score Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platform as Service (Pas) provider, and indicate which provider they used? Code Coverage Code Coverage Code Coverage Does the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Does the description reference deploying the integration reference use of a configuration management too? (e.g., di., di.) which is an accordance of the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (Pas) provider, and indicate which provider they used? Code Coverage Code Coverage Does the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? Yes = 2 p | 20 | Does the Working Prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formats of information in KAs (e.g., bullet points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for junior/non-technical staff)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 0 | |
| Does the Working Prototype have the ability to create user-defined rules for creation (e.g., mandatory fields) and lifecycle management (e.g., who, how, when revised and updated)? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new fecords or record types? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new fecords or record types? Ves = 1 pts; No = 0 Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning form existing records (e.g., typesw, content, usage) and prompting to create new KAs? PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? Code Climate Score Sos = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Substituting the prototype on an infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platform as Service (Pass) provider, and indicate which provider they used? Code Coverage Code Coverage Code Coverage Code Coverage Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platform as Service (Pass) provider, and indicate which provider they used? Code Coverage Code Coverage Code Coverage Code Coverage Code Coverage Does the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PasS provider? Ves = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Store = 2 | 21 | Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow controll of access and level of information by login? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| Does the Working Prototype trigger escalation processes (e.g., automated emails/texts to approes, reminders) for lifecycle activities? Joses the Working Prototype have the aiblify to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new records or record types? Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning form existing records (e.g., typesw, content, usage) and prompting to create new KAs? PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? Prototype Code Climate Score PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW Prototype and indicate which provider they used? Prototype a prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (Pass) provider, and indicate which provider they used? Prototype and underlying platform the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (Pass) provider, and indicate which provider they used? Prototype and underlying platform subsect on the unit tests for their code, and is the description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their | 22 | Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| boes the Working Prototype trigger escalation processes (e.g., automated emailsfexts to approes, reminders) for lifecycle activities? Does the Working Prototype have the aiblity to uddate and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to prediction per records or record types? Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning form existing records (e.g., typesw, content, usage) and prompting to create new KAs? Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? Test = 1 pts; No = 0 | 23 | Does the Working Prototype have the ability to create user-defined rules for creation (e.g., mandatory fields) and lifecycle management (e.g., who, how, when revised and updated)? | Yes = 1 pts: No = 0 | 1 | |
| is Does the Working Prototype have the ability to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new records or record types? Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning form existing records (e.g., typesw, content, usage) and prompting to create new KAS? Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW State evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? Code Climate Score PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | 24 | | | 1 | |
| Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning form existing records (e.g., typesw, content, usage) and prompting to create new KAS? Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 25 | | | 1 | |
| Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? Yes = 2 pits, No = 0 2 | 26 | | | 0 | |
| PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 | 27 | | | | |
| Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 | | | rking Prototype Review Score: | | |
| Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? Code Climate Score Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platform as Service (Paas) provider, and indicate which provider they used? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Does the description reference the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable? Code Coverage Code Coverage Code Coverage Code Search in the Continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laas or Paas provider? Does the description reference deploying the continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. alt, GitHub.svn) Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. alt, GitHub.svn) Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 3.5 = 0 pts 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | J,p | Ü | |
| Code Climate Score Code Climate Score Code Climate Score | 28 | | Vac = 2 ptc: No = 0 | 2 | |
| Code Coverage Code Coverage Code Coverage Code Coverage Code Searchard reference description reference continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? Code Ses the description reference continuous monitoring? Code ses the description reference continuous monitoring? Code Ses the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? Code Ses the description provide a description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. qit, GitHub.svm) Code Ses the description reference continuous monitoring? Code Ses the description reference continuous monitoring? Code Ses the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) Code Ses the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? | | | | | |
| Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (Paas) provider, and indicate which provider they used? Does the description reference the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable? Code Coverage Code Coverage Does the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Does the description reference continuous monitoring? Does the description reference continuous monitoring? Does the description reference continuous monitoring? Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (Paas) provider they used? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Does the description reference deploying the prototype on and the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Does the description reference continuous monitoring? Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (IpaaS) provider they used? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Does the description ference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (IpaaS) provider they used? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Zode Examination/Review Score: 29 | 29 | Code Climate Score | | 10 | |
| Does the description reference the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable? Code Coverage Code Coverage Does the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g., qit, GitHub, svn) Does the description reference continuous monitoring? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Does the description reference continuous monitoring? Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Are the prototype and underfying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Code Examination/Review Score: 29 | 20 | Doubt desirable of the state of | | 0 | |
| Second Coverage Second Cov | 30 | | | 2 | |
| Code Coverage Code Coverage S75% = 3 pts 5.65% = 1 pts | 31 | Does the description reference the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable? | | 2 | |
| Code Coverage Section | | | | | |
| Second Provide a description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? Yes = 2 pts: No = 0 2 | 32 | Code Coverage | | 1 | |
| Does the description provide a description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? | | | | - | |
| Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. qit, GitHub.svm) Does the description reference continuous monitoring? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? Code Examination/Review Score: 29 | | | | | |
| Does the description reference continuous monitoring? Does the description reference continuous monitoring? Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? Code Examination/Review Score: 29 | 33 | | | | |
| Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? Residual container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 2 Code Examination/Review Score: 29 | 34 | Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. git, GitHub,svn) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? Replaced to the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? Code Examination/Review Score: 29 | 35 | Does the description reference continuous monitoring? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Code Examination/Review Score: 29 | 36 | Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) | | 2 | |
| Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Code Examination/Review Score: 29 | 37 | | | | |
| Code Examination/Review Score: 29 | | | | 2 | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | OVERALL SCORE: | 82 | |

INFINITI CONSULTING GROUP, INC.

The criteria below will be used to pick Bidders for the Pre-Screen Award. A large part of the screening will be ensuring the working prototype matches the description in the GitHub repository, and vice versa.

GitHub Repsoitory Site: https://github.com/infiniticg/Infiniti-KMT Prototype Location:

| | ADMIN REVIEW | | | |
|----|--|---|----------------|----------|
| | Review Item | Possible Score | Assessed Score | Comments |
| 1 | Is the code and other documentation available in a GitHub repository? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| 2 | Has the GitHub repository been submitted on time, with no changes after the due date? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| 3 | Is a working prototype available (no 4xx or 5xx errors) in a public location specified in the README.md? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| 4 | Does the Vendor submitting the response have a verifiable history of delivering working software? | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 | 0 | |
| | | Very Intuitive = 15 | | |
| 5 | Is the user interface intuitive? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | 10 | |
| | | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | | |
| | | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| | | Very Easy = 15 | | |
| 6 | Is the user interface easy to use? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | 15 | |
| | | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | | |
| | | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| | TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW | Admin Review Score: | 25 | |
| 7 | | | 5 | |
| 8 | Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words? Does the description make reference to the US Didital Services playbook in their response? (see https://playbook.cio.gov) | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 5 | |
| 9 | Does the description make reference to the US Digital Services playbook in their response? (See https://playbook.ciogov) Does the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the quality of the prototype submitted? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 10 | Does the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the quality of the prototype submitted? Does the description make reference to a team that includes, at a minimum, five (5) of the labor categories defentiled in the RF1? | | 2 | |
| 11 | Does the description make reterence to a team that includes, at a minimum, five (s) of the labor categories as identified in the RF-I? Does the description reference human centered design techniques/tools? Ones the description reference human centered design techniques/tools? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 12 | | | 2 | |
| 13 | Does the prototype reflect the use of the tools and is it consistent with the description, as best as you can tell? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 14 | Does the description reference a design style guide and/or pattern library? Does the prototype reflect the use of design style guide and/or pattern library and is it consistent with the description? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 15 | | | 2 | |
| 16 | Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies? Does the prototype reflect the use of at least five (6) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies and is the use consistent with the description? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 17 | Does the description make reference to performing usability tests with people? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 18 | Does the description make reterence to performing usability tests with people? Does the description make reterence to using an iterative approach, where feedback informed and influenced subsequent work? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 10 | bues the description make releasing an iterative approach, where regulate minimized and initiatived subsequent work: | Technical Review Score: | | |
| | WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW | Toomiou Noview Goore. | | |
| | Does the Working Prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (KAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of centent, including documents, user- | | | |
| 19 | Does in Working Theory in the burns to cash, shear in the work in the burns to cash, and workflow in the burns to cash, and th | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 20 | Does the Working Prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formats of information in KAs (e.g., bullet points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for junior/non-technical staff)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow control of access and reverse for the control of access and reverse for | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | Does the Working Prototype have the ability to create user-defined rules for creation (e.g., mandatory fields) and lifecycle management (e.g., who, how, when revised and updated)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 24 | Does the Working Prototype Trave tire ability to treate user-curriented treats or treatment to the source management (e.g., who, now, when revised and updated)? Does the Working Prototype trave tire ability to treate user-currient treatment to the source management (e.g., who, now, when revised and updated)? Does the Working Prototype trave tire ability to treat users curriented to the source of the sou | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | Does the Working Prototype Inglet eschalation processes (e.g., administration processes (e.g., | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 26 | Does the Working Prototype have the along to update and improve Kas and access the value usage as input to predicting new records or record types? Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning form existing records (e.g., typesw, content, usage) and prompting to create new KAs? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | Does the Working Prototype show minovacion by realining form trassing recovery experience described by the realining form trassing recovery experience and prompting to create new recs: Does the Working Prototype show minovacion by realining form trassing recovery experience above. Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above. | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| ۷. | | rking Prototype Review Score: | | |
| | PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW | g . rototype nemen score. | 10 | |
| 28 | Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? | Yes = 2 pts: No = 0 | 2 | |
| | | > 3.5 = 10 pts | | |
| 29 | Code Climate Score | < 3.5 = 10 pts | 10 | |
| 30 | Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platform as Service (Paas) provider, and indicate which provider they used? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 31 | Does the description feterence the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | and description relations the displacement of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable: | > 85% = 5 pts | | |
| | | > 75% = 3 pts | | |
| 32 | Code Coverage | > 75% = 3 pts > 65% = 1 pt | 1 | |
| | | < 64.9% = 0 pts | | |
| 33 | Does the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? | < 64.9% = 0 pts Yes = 2 pts: No = 0 | 2 | |
| 34 | Does the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running or tests and continuously depicy their code to their laas or Paas provider? Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g., di, Gilf-Hub,svn) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description of continuous integration reference use or a configuration management tool / (e.g. gir, Github,Svn) Does the description of continuous minegration reference use or a configuration management tool / (e.g. gir, Github,Svn) Does the description of continuous monitoring? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 37 | | | 2 | |
| | Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 10 | | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 de Examination/Review Score: | | |
| | Co | OVERALL SCORE: | | |
| | | OVERALL SCORE: | 91 | |

PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS (PwC) PUBLIC SECTOR LLP

The criteria below will be used to pick Bidders for the Pre-Screen Award. A large part of the screening will be ensuring the working prototype matches the description in the GitHub repository, and vice versa.

GitHub Repsoitory Site: https://github.com/MustWin/CDT-PQVP-0118 Prototype Location:

| | ADMIN REVIEW | | | |
|--|---|--|----------------|----------|
| | Review Item | Possible Score | Assessed Score | Comments |
| Is the code and other documentation available in a GitHub repository? | | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| 2 Has the GitHub repository been submitted on time, with no changes after the due date? | | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| 3 Is a working prototype available (no 4xx or 5xx errors) in a public location specified in the README.md* | | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| Does the Vendor submitting the response have a verifiable history of delivering working software? | | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 | 5 | |
| | | Very Intuitive = 15 | | |
| | | Somewhat Easy = 10 | | |
| 5 Is the user interface intuitive? | | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | 5 | |
| | | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| | | Very Easy = 15 | | |
| | | Somewhat Easy = 10 | | |
| 6 Is the user interface easy to use? | | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | 5 | |
| | | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| | | Admin Review Score: | | |
| | TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW | Admin Review Score: | 15 | |
| 7. In the Mandada Tankalad Agency th Nametics and a 0.000 weeks | TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW | Van Entri Na O | 5 | |
| 7 Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words? 8 Does the description make reference to the US Digital Services playbook in their response? (see https:// | sleubaalt eig gau) | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description make reference to the US Digital Services playbook in their response? (see https:// | | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the quality of the proto Does the description make reference to a team that includes, at a minimum, five (5) of the labor category | | | 2 | |
| | es as identified in the KFT? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | - 1-110 | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | n tell? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 13 Does the description reference a design style guide and/or pattern library? | | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 14 Does the prototype reflect the use of design style guide and/or pattern library and is it consistent with th | | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | | |
| 15 Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web tech | | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the prototype reflect the use of at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side we | technologies and is the use consistent with the description? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 17 Does the description make reference to performing usability tests with people? | | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description make reference to using an iterative approach, where feedback informed and influence | nced subsequent work? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | | Technical Review Score: | 27 | |
| | WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW | | | |
| configurable forms, tables, and workflows. | original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of centent, including documents, user- | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 20 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formats of information in KA | (e.g., bullet points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for junior/non-technical staff)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 21 Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow controll of access and level of | information by login? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 22 Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information across systems and ch | annels, as required? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 23 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to create user-defined rules for creation (e.g., mandatory fi | elds) and lifecycle management (e.g., who, how, when revised and updated)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| Does the Working Prototype trigger escalation processes (e.g., automated emails/texts to approers, ren | | Yes = 1 pts: No = 0 | 1 | |
| 25 Does the Working Prototype have the aiblity to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage | | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 26 Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning form existing records (e.g., typesw, content, u | | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 27 Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? | ago/ and prompting to dicate new rese. | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the working Prototype include any other userur and/or creative readiles not mentioned above: | Worl | king Prototype Review Score: | 10 | |
| | PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW | ning i rototype neview ocore. | 10 | |
| 28 Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? | TROTOTTI E GODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW | V O-I N- O | 2 | |
| | | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | | |
| 29 Code Climate Score | | > 3.5 = 10 pts | 0 | |
| | | < 3.5 = 0 pts | | |
| 30 Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platfo | | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description reference the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough a | d understandable? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | | |
| | | > 85% = 5 pts | | |
| 32 Code Coverage | | > 75% = 3 pts | 0 | |
| | | > 65% = 1 pt | - | |
| | | < 64.9% = 0 pts | | |
| 33 Does the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the re | | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. | git, GitHub,svn) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description reference continuous monitoring? | | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 36 Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-lev | el virtualization) | Yes = 2 pts: No = 0 | 2 | |
| 37 Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? | | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 38 Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and fre | e of charge? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | | le Examination/Review Score: | 16 | |
| | | OVERALL SCORE: | 68 | |

QUALAPPS, INC.

The criteria below will be used to pick Bidders for the Pre-Screen Award. A large part of the screening will be ensuring the working prototype matches the description in the GitHub repository, and vice versa.

GitHub Repsoitory Site: https://github.com/jpuli/payp/ Account Name for JIRA Respository: qualapps.jira.read@gmail.com Password for Gmail Username for JIRA Respository: PQVPjira

| ADMIN REVIEW | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Review Item | Possible Score | Assessed Score | Comments |
| Is the code and other documentation available in a GitHub repository? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| Has the GitHub repository been submitted on time, with no changes after the due date? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| Is a working prototype available (no 4xx or 5xx errors) in a public location specified in the README.md? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| Does the Vendor submitting the response have a verifiable history of delivering working software? | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 | 5 | |
| | Very Intuitive = 15 | | |
| 5 Is the user interface intuitive? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | 15 | |
| is the user interface intuitive? | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | 15 | |
| | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| | Very Easy = 15 | | |
| Is the user interface easy to use? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | 15 | |
| is the user interface easy to use? | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | 15 | |
| | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| | Admin Review Score: | 35 | |
| TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW | | | |
| Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words? | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 | 0 | |
| Does the description make reference to the US Digital Services playbook in their response? (see https://playbook.cio.gov) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the quality of the prototype submitted? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description make reference to a team that includes, at a minimum, five (5) of the labor categories as identified in the RF1? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description reference human centered design techniques/tools? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 2 Does the prototype reflect the use of the tools and is it consistent with the description, as best as you can tell? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description reference a design style guide and/or pattern library? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the prototype reflect the use of design style guide and/or pattern library and is it consistent with the description? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 5 Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the prototype reflect the use of at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies and is the use consistent with the description? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 7 Does the description make reference to performing usability tests with people? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description make reference to using an iterative approach, where feedback informed and influenced subsequent work? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW | Technical Review Score: | 22 | |
| | | , | |
| Does the Working Prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (KAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of centent, including documents, user-configurable forms, tables, and workflows. | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| Does the Working Prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formats of information in KAs (e.g., bullet points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for junior/non-technical staff)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow controll of access and level of information by login? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 2 Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 3 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to create user-defined rules for creation (e.g., mandatory fields) and lifecycle management (e.g., who, how, when revised and updated)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 4 Does the Working Prototype trigger escalation processes (e.g., automated emails/texts to approers, reminders) for lifecycle activities? | Yes = 1 pts: No = 0 | 1 | |
| 5 Does the Working Prototyce have the aiblity to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new records or record types? | Yes = 1 pts: No = 0 | 0 | |
| Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning form existing records (e.g., typesw, content, usage) and prompting to create new KAs? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 7 Does the Working Prototyce include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? | Yes = 2 pts: No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Working Prototype Review Score: | | |
| PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | · · · · · | |
| 8 Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 9 Code Climate Score | > 3.5 = 10 pts | 10 | |
| Code Climate Score | < 3.5 = 0 pts | 10 | |
| Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platform as Service (Paas) provider, and indicate which provider they used? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 1 Does the description reference the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | > 85% = 5 pts | | |
| 2 Code Coverage | > 75% = 3 pts | 1 | |
| - Cook Contrage | > 65% = 1 pt | | |
| | < 64.9% = 0 pts | | |
| B Does the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. git, GitHub,svn) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description reference continuous monitoring? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 6 Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 7 Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| The state of the s | Code Examination/Review Score: | | |
| | OVERALL SCORE: | | |

STANFIELD SYSTEMS, INC.

The criteria below will be used to pick Bidders for the Pre-Screen Award. A large part of the screening will be ensuring the working prototype matches the description in the GitHub repository, and vice versa.

GitHub Repsoitory Site: https://github.com/StanfieldSystems/KARMA Prototype Location:

| ADMIN REVIEW | | | |
|--|--|----------------|----------|
| Review Item | Possible Score | Assessed Score | Comments |
| 1 Is the code and other documentation available in a GitHub repository? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| Has the GitHub repository been submitted on time, with no changes after the due date? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| Is a working prototype available (no 4xx or 5xx errors) in a public location specified in the README.md? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| 4 Does the Vendor submitting the response have a verifiable history of delivering working software? | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 | 5 | |
| | Very Intuitive = 15 | | |
| 5 Is the user interface intuitive? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | 5 | |
| | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | | |
| | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| | Very Easy = 15 | | |
| 6 Is the user interface easy to use? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | 5 | |
| | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | | |
| | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW | Admin Review Score | 15 | |
| | Ver Free No. 0 | 5 | |
| 7 Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words? 8 IDess the description make reference to the US Digital Services playbook in their response? (see https://playbook.cip.gov) | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 0 | |
| Does the description make reference to the US Digital Services playbook in their responser (see https://pibbook.cio.dov) Does the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the quality of the prototype submitted? Does the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the quality of the prototype submitted? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Some the description make reference to a single reader with me responsibility or an explanary or the priority solumited? To Does the description make reference to a stample reader with me responsibility or an explanary or the priority solumited? To Does the description make reference to a stam that includes, at a minimum, five (5) of the labor categories as identified in the RFI? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| to boss the description make reterring to a team that includes, at a minimum, the 157 of the tabor categories as identified in the RF1? Does the description make reterring to a team that includes, at a minimum, the 157 of the tabor categories as identified in the RF1? Does the description make reterring to a team that includes, at a minimum, the 157 of the tabor categories as identified in the RF1? Does the description reference human centered design techniques/tools? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 12 Does the prototype reflect the use of the tools and is it consistent with the description, as best as you can tell? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 12 Does the prototype tener, the use of the tools and is it consistent with not bescription, as best as you can rein? 13 Does the description reference a design style quide and/or pattern library? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| to Does the description retretice a design style guide and/or patient indiary. 10 Does the prototype reflect the use of design style guide and/or patient indiary. 11 Does the prototype reflect the use of design style guide and/or patient indiary. | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| to Does the produppe tense in case or useful saye quale animor patient indirect and is a consistent with useful useful useful control to the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| to Does the prototype reflect the use of at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies and is the use consistent with the description? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 17 Does the description make reference to performing usability tests with people? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 18 Does the description make reference to using an iterative approach, where feedback informed and influenced subsequent work? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 2000 the decomption make resolution to during an accurate approach, minor reconstant and minorities disable during the make resolution and minorities disable during the minorities during t | Technical Review Score | | |
| WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW | | | |
| Does the Working Prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (KAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of centent, including documents, use | | | |
| 19 Joes the violating Prototype native the ability to easily cleate knowledge atticles (KAS)? (These can be drighted records (e.g., specific work instructions of content) ability to easily cleate knowledge atticles (KAS)? (These can be drighted records (e.g., specific work instructions of content) ability to easily cleate knowledge atticles (KAS)? (These can be drighted records (e.g., specific work instructions of content) ability to easily cleate knowledge atticles (KAS)? (These can be drighted records (e.g., specific work instructions of content) ability to easily cleate knowledge at ticks. | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 0 | |
| 20 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formats of information in KAs (e.g., bullet points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for junior/non-technical staff)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 0 | |
| 21 Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow controll of access and level of information by login? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 22 Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 0 | |
| Does the Working Prototype have the ability to create user-defined rules for creation (e.g., mandatory fields) and lifecycle management (e.g., who, how, when revised and updated)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 0 | |
| 24 Does the Working Prototype trigger escalation processes (e.g., automated emails/texts to approers, reminders) for lifecycle activities? | Yes = 1 pts: No = 0 | 0 | |
| 25 Does the Working Prototype have the aiblity to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new records or record types? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 26 Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning form existing records (e.g., typesw, content, usage) and prompting to create new KAs? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 0 | |
| 27 Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 0 | |
| | Working Prototype Review Score: | 2 | |
| PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW | | | |
| 28 Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 29 Code Climate Score | > 3.5 = 10 pts | 10 | |
| | < 3.5 = 0 pts | | |
| 30 Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platform as Service (Paas) provider, and indicate which provider they used? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 31 Does the description reference the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | > 85% = 5 pts | | |
| 32 Code Coverage | > 75% = 3 pts | 1 | |
| odd ordago | > 65% = 1 pt | | |
| | < 64.9% = 0 pts | | |
| Does the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | - |
| Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. git, GitHub,svn) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 35 Does the description reference continuous monitoring? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | · |
| Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Code Examination/Review Score: | | |
| | OVERALL SCORE | : 71 | |

THE IFISH GROUP, INC.

The criteria below will be used to pick Bidders for the Pre-Screen Award. A large part of the screening will be ensuring the working prototype matches the description in the GitHub repository, and vice versa.

GitHub Repsoitory Site: https://github.com/ifishgroup/pqvp-kmt Prototype Location:

| ADMIN REVIEW | | | |
|--|--|----------------|----------|
| Review Item | Possible Score | Assessed Score | Comments |
| 1 Is the code and other documentation available in a GitHub repository? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| Has the GitHub repository been submitted on time, with no changes after the due date? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| Is a working prototype available (no 4xx or 5xx errors) in a public location specified in the README.md? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| 4 Does the Vendor submitting the response have a verifiable history of delivering working software? | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 | 0 | |
| | Very Intuitive = 15 | | |
| 5 Is the user interface intuitive? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | 10 | |
| | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | | |
| | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| | Very Easy = 15 | | |
| 6 Is the user interface easy to use? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | 15 | |
| | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | | |
| | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW | Admin Review Score: | 25 | |
| | Van Entri Na O | 5 | |
| 7 Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2.000 words? 8 Does the description make reference to the US Didtal Services olavbook in their response? (see https://olavbook.cio.gov) | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Dioes the description make reference to ne us bliquital Services playoos in heir responses (1 see https://playtook.cogov) Does the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the quality of the protections of the protection | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Joes are description make reference to a smaller leader with the responsibility for the plant of the description make reference to a smaller leader with the responsibility for the plant of the plant o | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description make retereince to a team that includes, at a minimum, live (5) of the labor categories as identified in the KF1? Does the description make retereince to a team that includes, at a minimum, live (5) of the labor categories as identified in the KF1? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the prototype reflect the use of the tools and is tronsistent with the description, as best as you can tell? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 12 Does the photographical the use of the tools and is it consistent with the description reference a design style quide and/or pattern library? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| To Does the prototype reference a design style quide and/or patient library and is it consistent with the description? 10 Does the prototype reference a design style quide and/or patient library and is it consistent with the description? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 175 Does the description reference at leasting savie quice and patent mindry ain is it consistent with the execution? Description of the description reference at leasting savie quice and patent mindry ain is it consistent with the execution? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Sees the prototype reflect the use of at least five 1.0 indem and open source frontend or client side web technologies and is the use consistent with the description? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 17 Does the description make reference to performing usability tests with people? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 18 Does the description make reference to using an iterative approach, where feedback informed and influenced subsequent work? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description make resistance to using an instance approach, more recessional minimated description from: | Technical Review Score: | | |
| WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW | | | |
| Does the Working Prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (KAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of centent, including documents, user- | | | |
| to Dies liet virtually trouting the late the ability to easily create. Introducing ancies (rAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) allow packages or centent, including documents, user-configurable forms, tables, and workflows. | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 20 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formats of information in KAs (e.g., bullet points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for junior/non-technical staff)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 21 Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow controll of access and level of information by login? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 22 Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? | Yes = 1 pts: No = 0 | 1 | |
| Does the Working Prototype have the ability to create user-defined rules for creation (e.g., mandatory fields) and lifecycle management (e.g., who, how, when revised and updated)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 24 Does the Working Prototype trigger escalation processes (e.g., automated emails/texts to approers, reminders) for lifecycle activities? | Yes = 1 pts: No = 0 | 1 | |
| 25 Does the Working Prototype have the aiblity to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new records or record types? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 26 Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning form existing records (e.g., typesw, content, usage) and prompting to create new KAs? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 27 Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | orking Prototype Review Score: | | |
| PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW | | | |
| Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 29 Code Climate Score | > 3.5 = 10 pts | 10 | |
| CODE CHITISTE SCOTE | < 3.5 = 0 pts | 10 | |
| Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platform as Service (Paas) provider, and indicate which provider they used? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 31 Does the description reference the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | > 85% = 5 pts | | |
| 32 Code Coverage | > 75% = 3 pts | 5 | |
| 32 Code Coverage | > 65% = 1 pt | 5 | |
| | < 64.9% = 0 pts | | |
| 33 Does the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? | Yes = 2 pts: No = 0 | 2 | |
| 34 Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. qt, GitHub,svn) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 35 Does the description reference continuous monitoring? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| See the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 37 Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 38 Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | | | |
| | ode Examination/Review Score: | | |

WEST ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

The criteria below will be used to pick Bidders for the Pre-Screen Award. A large part of the screening will be ensuring the working prototype matches the description in the GitHub repository, and vice versa.

GitHub Repsoitory Site: https://github.com/watipqvp/CDT-PQVP-0118-WATI Prototype Location:

| ADMIN REVIEW | | | |
|--|--|----------------|----------|
| Review Item | Possible Score | Assessed Score | Comments |
| 1 Is the code and other documentation available in a GitHub repository? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| Has the GitHub repository been submitted on time, with no changes after the due date? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| Is a working prototype available (no 4xx or 5xx errors) in a public location specified in the README.md? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| 4 Does the Vendor submitting the response have a verifiable history of delivering working software? | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 | 5 | |
| | Very Intuitive = 15 | | |
| 5 Is the user interface intuitive? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | 5 | |
| | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | | |
| | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| | Very Easy = 15 | | |
| 6 Is the user interface easy to use? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | 10 | |
| | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | | |
| | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW | Admin Review Score | 20 | |
| | Van Entri Na O | 0 | |
| 7 Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words? 8 Does the description make reference to the US Digital Services playbook in their response? (see https://playbook.cio.gov) | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description make reference to the US Jidital Services piaybook in their response? (see https://piaybook.cib.dov) Does the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the quality of the prototype submitted? Does the description make reference to a single leader with the response is the quality of the prototype submitted? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| boss the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the quality for the proteopres assistant field in the RFI? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| to boss the description make reterine to a ream that includes, at a minimum, tive (5) of the factor categories as identified in the KFT? 10 Does the description make reterine to a ream that includes/fools? 11 Does the description reference human centered design techniques/fools? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the prototype reflect the use of the tools and is it consistent with the description, as best as you can tell? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 12 Does the prototype tenera, the use of the tools and is it consistent with the description reference a design style quide and/or pattern library? 13 Does the description reference a design style quide and/or pattern library? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| To Does the description retretice a design style guide arror pattern library and is it consistent with the description? 10 Does the prototype reflect the use of design style guide arror pattern library and is it consistent with the description? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 17 Does the productive feter the case of desarth street damagnetic feter and the feter | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| to Does the prototype reflect the use of at least five (j) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies and is the use consistent with the description? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 17 Does the description make reference to performing usability tests with people? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 18 Does the description make reference to using an iterative approach, where feedback informed and influenced subsequent work? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 2000 the decomposition make reference to during this reference, minor recondent months during an announced decomposition months. | Technical Review Score | | |
| WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW | | | |
| 19 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (KAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of centent, including documents, user- | | | |
| configurable forms, tables, and workflows. | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 20 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formats of information in KAs (e.g., bullet points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for junior/non-technical staff)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 21 Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow controll of access and level of information by login? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 22 Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 23 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to create user-defined rules for creation (e.g., mandatory fields) and lifecycle management (e.g., who, how, when revised and updated)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 24 Does the Working Prototype trigger escalation processes (e.g., automated emails/texts to approers, reminders) for lifecycle activities? | Yes = 1 pts: No = 0 | 1 | |
| 25 Does the Working Prototype have the aiblity to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new records or record types? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 26 Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning form existing records (e.g., typesw, content, usage) and prompting to create new KAs? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 27 Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Working Prototype Review Score: | 10 | |
| PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW | | | |
| 28 Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 29 Code Climate Score | > 3.5 = 10 pts | 10 | |
| | < 3.5 = 0 pts | | |
| 30 Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platform as Service (Paas) provider, and indicate which provider they used? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description reference the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | > 85% = 5 pts | | |
| 32 Code Coverage | > 75% = 3 pts | 1 | |
| John College | > 65% = 1 pt | | |
| | < 64.9% = 0 pts | | |
| 33 Does the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. git, GitHub,svn) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 35 Does the description reference continuous monitoring? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 37 Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Code Examination/Review Score: | | |
| | OVERALL SCORE | 81 | |

Visionary Integration Professionals

The criteria below will be used to pick Bidders for the Pre-Screen Award. A large part of the screening will be ensuring the working prototype matches the description in the GitHub repository, and vice versa.

GitHub Repsoitory Site: https://github.com/adhawan-vip/vip_adpq/ Prototype Location: https://vip-adpq.herokuapp.com/#/

| AD | MIN REVIEW | | |
|--|--|--------------|----------|
| Review Item | Possible Score Ass | sessed Score | Comments |
| Is the code and other documentation available in a GitHub repository? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| 2 Has the GitHub repository been submitted on time, with no changes after the due date? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| 3 Is a working prototype available (no 4xx or 5xx errors) in a public location specified in the README.md? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| 4 Does the Vendor submitting the response have a verifiable history of delivering working software? | Yes = 5 pts: No = 0 | 5 | |
| | Very Intuitive = 15 | | |
| 5 Is the user interface intuitive? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | | |
| | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | 10 | |
| | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| | Very Easy = 15 | | |
| Is the user interface easy to use? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | | |
| | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | 15 | |
| | | | |
| | Very Difficult = 0 Admin Review Score: | 30 | |
| TECHNICAL | . APPROACH REVIEW | 30 | |
| 7 Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words? | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 | 5 | |
| Is the venuor's reclinical approach in the US Digital Services playbook in their response? (see https://playbook.cio.gov) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the quality of the prototype submitted? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the updately of the prototype submitted? Does the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the updately of the labor categories as identified in the RFI? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description reference human centered design techniques/tools? Does the description reference human centered design techniques/tools? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the prototype reflect the use of the tools and is it consistent with the description, as best as you can tell? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | | 2 | |
| | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | | |
| Does the prototype reflect the use of at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies and is the use consistent people? | | 2 | |
| | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 18 Does the description make reference to using an iterative approach, where feedback informed and influenced subsequent work? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| WODUNG | Technical Review Score: | 27 | |
| | PROTOTYPE REVIEW | | |
| Does the Working Prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (KAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instruction configurable forms, tables, and workflows. | uctions or content) and/or packages of centent, including documents, user- Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 20 Does the Working Prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formats of information in KAs (e.g., bullet points for senior technical I | evels, scripted specific details for junior/non-technical staff)? Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 21 Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow controll of access and level of information by login? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 22 Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? | Yes = 1 pts: No = 0 | 1 | |
| Does the Working Prototype have the ability to create user-defined rules for creation (e.g., mandatory fields) and lifecycle management (e.g., which is the control of the | no, how, when revised and updated)? Yes = 1 pts: No = 0 | 1 | |
| Does the Working Prototype trigger escalation processes (e.g., automated emails/texts to approers, reminders) for lifecycle activities? | Yes = 1 pts: No = 0 | 0 | |
| 25 Does the Working Prototype have the aiblity to update and improve Kas and access the value of usage as input to predicting new records or rec | | 0 | |
| 26 Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning form existing records (e.g., typesw, content, usage) and prompting to create new KAS* | | 0 | |
| Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the working Prototype include any other userur and/or creative reatures not mentioned above? | Working Prototype Review Score: | 7 | |
| DPOTOTYDE CO | DE EXAMINATION/REVIEW | | |
| Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? | | 2 | |
| | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | | |
| 29 Code Climate Score | > 3.5 = 10 pts | 10 | |
| | < 3.5 = 0 pts | | |
| Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platform as Service (Paas) provider, and indicate the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platform as Service (Paas) provider, and indicate the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platform as Service (Paas) provider, and indicate the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platform as Service (Paas) provider, and indicate the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platform as Service (Paas) provider, and indicate the description of the descri | | 2 | |
| Does the description reference the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | > 85% = 5 pts | | |
| 32 Code Coverage | > 75% = 3 pts | 3 | |
| Could Dovings | > 65% = 1 pt | 3 | |
| | < 64.9% = 0 pts | | |
| Does the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy | heir code to their laaS or PaaS provider? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. git. GitHub.svn) | Yes = 2 pts: No = 0 | 2 | |
| 35 Does the description reference continuous monitoring? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| besi the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | 165 = 2 pts; NO = 0 | | |
| | Vac = 2 ntc: No = 0 | | |
| Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Code Examination/Review Score: | 31 | |

xFusion Technologies, Inc.

The criteria below will be used to pick Bidders for the Pre-Screen Award. A large part of the screening will be ensuring the working prototype matches the description in the GitHub repository, and vice versa.

GitHub Repsoitory Site: https://github.com/xFusionTech/KMT Prototype Location: http://ec2-18-144-75-92.us-west-1.compute.amazonaws.com:8088/

| | ADMIN REVIEW | | | |
|-----|--|---|----------------|----------|
| | Review Item | Possible Score | Assessed Score | Comments |
| 1 | Is the code and other documentation available in a GitHub repository? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| | Has the GitHub repository been submitted on time, with no changes after the due date? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| | Is a working prototype available (no 4xx or 5xx errors) in a public location specified in the README.md? | Pass/Fail | Pass | |
| 4 | Does the Vendor submitting the response have a verifiable history of delivering working software? | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 | 5 | |
| | | Very Intuitive = 15 | | |
| 5 | 5 Is the user interface intuitive? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | 10 | |
| 3 | is the user interface intuitive: | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | 10 | |
| | | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| | | Very Easy = 15 | | |
| 6 | Is the user interface easy to use? | Somewhat Easy = 10 | 15 | |
| U | | Somewhat Difficult = 5 | 15 | |
| | | Very Difficult = 0 | | |
| | | Admin Review Score: | 30 | |
| | TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW | | | |
| | Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words? | Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 | 5 | |
| | Does the description make reference to the US Digital Services playbook in their response? (see https://playbook.cio.gov) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the quality of the prototype submitted? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description make reference to a team that includes, at a minimum, five (5) of the labor categories as identified in the RFI? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description reference human centered design techniques/tools? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the prototype reflect the use of the tools and is it consistent with the description, as best as you can tell? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description reference a design style guide and/or pattern library? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the prototype reflect the use of design style guide and/or pattern library and is it consistent with the description? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the prototype reflect the use of at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies and is the use consistent with the description? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description make reference to performing usability tests with people? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 18 | Does the description make reference to using an iterative approach, where feedback informed and influenced subsequent work? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Technical Review Score: | 27 | |
| | WORKING PROTOTYPE REVIEW | Technical Review Score: | 27 | |
| - 1 | Does the Working Prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (KAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages of centent, including documents, user- | | | |
| | Does the working mountype have the ability to easily create. Knowledge atticles (KAS)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages or centent, including documents, user-conflourable forms, tables, and workflows. | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| | | | | |
| 20 | Does the Working Prototype have the ability to provide multiple levels and formats of information in KAs (e.g., bullet points for senior technical levels, scripted specific details for junior/non-technical staff)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 21 | Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow controll of access and level of information by login? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 22 | Does the Working Prototype allow for the promotion of process and information across systems and channels, as required? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 23 | Does the Working Prototype have the ability to create user-defined rules for creation (e.g., mandatory fields) and lifecycle management (e.g., who, how, when revised and updated)? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 24 | Does the Working Prototype trigger escalation processes (e.g., automated emails/texts to approers, reminders) for lifecycle activities? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 25 | Does the Working Prototype have the aiblity to update and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to predicting new records or record types? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 26 | Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning form existing records (e.g., typesw, content, usage) and prompting to create new KAs? | Yes = 1 pts; No = 0 | 1 | |
| 27 | Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| • | | orking Prototype Review Score: | 10 | |
| | PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW | | | |
| 28 | Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 29 | Code Climate Score | > 3.5 = 10 pts | 10 | |
| 23 | Onde Official Code | < 3.5 = 0 pts | 10 | |
| 30 | Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (laas) or Platform as Service (Paas) provider, and indicate which provider they used? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 31 | Does the description reference the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | | > 85% = 5 pts | | |
| 32 | Code Courses | > 75% = 3 pts | 3 | |
| 32 | Code Coverage | > 65% = 1 pt | 3 | |
| | | < 64.9% = 0 pts | | |
| 33 | Does the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running of tests and continuously deploy their code to their laaS or PaaS provider? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. git, GitHub,svn) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description reference continuous monitoring? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| 36 | Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization) | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge? | Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 | 2 | |
| | | de Examination/Review Score: | | |
| | UL CONTRACTOR CONTRACT | | | |