

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

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

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

*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/ADPO>

Location of Accounts to Login to the Prototype: <https://github.com/agilesix/ADPO/wiki>

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

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	
5	Is the user interface intuitive?	Very Intuitive = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	15	
6	Is the user interface easy to use?	Very Easy = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	15	
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	
8	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	
9	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	
10	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	
11	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	
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 the description?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
15	Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
16	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	
Technical Review Score:			27	
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 content, 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 control 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 approvers, reminders) for lifecycle activities?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
25	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?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
26	Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning from 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:			7	
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 < 3.5 = 0 pts	10	
30	Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) 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	
32	Code Coverage	> 85% = 5 pts > 75% = 3 pts > 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts	1	
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 IaaS 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. git, GitHub, svn)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
35	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	
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	
Code Examination/Review Score:			25	
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://dhsknowledgegemanagement.cfapps.io>

Location of Accountants to Login to the Prototype:

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	5	
5	Is the user interface intuitive?	Very Intuitive = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	10	
6	Is the user interface easy to use?	Very Easy = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	15	
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	
8	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	
9	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	
10	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	
11	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	
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 the description?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
15	Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
16	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	0	
Technical Review Score:			25	
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 content, 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 control 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 approvers, reminders) for lifecycle activities?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
25	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?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
26	Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning from 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	0	
Working Prototype Review Score:			8	
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 < 3.5 = 0 pts	10	
30	Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) 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	
32	Code Coverage	> 85% = 5 pts > 75% = 3 pts > 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts	1	
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 IaaS 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., git, GitHub, svn)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
35	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	
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	
Code 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 Repository Site: <https://github.com/HOTB-Software/adpq-2018/tree/master>

Prototype Location:

ADPQ-Credentials - Config Files:



15D8B841.zip

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	
5	Is the user interface intuitive?	Very Intuitive = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	10	
6	Is the user interface easy to use?	Very Easy = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	10	
			Admin Review Score:	20
TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW				
7	Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words?	Yes = 5 pts; No = 0	5	
8	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	
9	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	
10	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	
11	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	
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 the description?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	0	
15	Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
16	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	
			Technical Review Score:	25
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 content, 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	0	
21	Does the Working Prototype allow for role-based security access, to allow control 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 approvers, reminders) for lifecycle activities?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
25	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?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
26	Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning from 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	2	
			Working Prototype Review Score:	8
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 < 3.5 = 0 pts	10	
30	Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) or Platform as a 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	
32	Code Coverage	> 85% = 5 pts > 75% = 3 pts > 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts	1	
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 IaaS 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. git, GitHub.svn)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
35	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	
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	
			Code Examination/Review Score:	29
			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 Repository Site: <https://github.com/infiniticg/Infiniti-KMT>

Prototype Location:

Location of Accountants to Login to the Prototype:

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	
5	Is the user interface intuitive?	Very Intuitive = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	10	
6	Is the user interface easy to use?	Very Easy = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	15	
ADMIN REVIEW Score:			25	
TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW				
7	Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words?	Yes = 5 pts; No = 0	5	
8	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	
9	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	
10	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	
11	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	
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 the description?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
15	Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
16	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	
Technical Review Score:			27	
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 content, 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 control 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 approvers, reminders) for lifecycle activities?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
25	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?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
26	Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning from 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 < 3.5 = 0 pts	10	
30	Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) or Platform as a 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	
32	Code Coverage	> 85% = 5 pts > 75% = 3 pts > 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts	1	
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 IaaS 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., git, GitHub, svn)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
35	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	
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	
Code Examination/Review Score:			29	
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 Repository Site: <https://github.com/MustWin/CDT-PQVP-0118>

Prototype Location:

Location of Accountants to Login to the Prototype:

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	5	
5	Is the user interface intuitive?	Very Intuitive = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	5	
6	Is the user interface easy to use?	Very Easy = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	5	
ADMIN REVIEW Score:			15	
TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW				
7	Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words?	Yes = 5 pts; No = 0	5	
8	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	
9	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	
10	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	
11	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	
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 the description?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
15	Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
16	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	
Technical Review Score:			27	
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 content, 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 control 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 approvers, reminders) for lifecycle activities?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
25	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?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
26	Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning from 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 < 3.5 = 0 pts	0	
30	Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) or Platform as a 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	
32	Code Coverage	> 85% = 5 pts > 75% = 3 pts > 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts	0	
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 IaaS 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., git, GitHub, svn)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
35	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	
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	
Code Examination/Review Score:			16	
OVERALL SCORE:			66	

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 Repository Site: <https://github.com/puli/pqvp/>
 Account Name for JIRA Repository: qualapps.jira.read@gmail.com
 Password for Gmail Username for JIRA Repository: PQVPjira

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	5
5	Is the user interface intuitive?	Very Intuitive = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	15
6	Is the user interface easy to use?	Very Easy = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	15
		Admin Review Score:	35
TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW			
7	Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words?	Yes = 5 pts; No = 0	0
8	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
9	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
10	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
11	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
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 the description?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2
15	Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2
16	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
		Technical Review Score:	22
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 content, 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 control 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 approvers, reminders) for lifecycle activities?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1
25	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?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	0
26	Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning from 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:	9
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 < 3.5 = 0 pts	10
30	Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) 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
32	Code Coverage	> 85% = 5 pts > 75% = 3 pts > 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts	1
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 IaaS 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. git, GitHub, svn)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2
35	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
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
		Code Examination/Review Score:	25
		OVERALL SCORE:	95

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 Repository Site: <https://github.com/StanfieldSystems/KARMA>

Prototype Location:

Location of Accountants to Login to the Prototype:

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?		5	
5	Is the user interface intuitive?	Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 Very Intuitive = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	5	
6	Is the user interface easy to use?	Very Easy = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	5	
			Admin Review Score:	15
TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW				
7	Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words?	Yes = 5 pts; No = 0	5	
8	Does the description make reference to the US Digital Services playbook in their response? (see https://playbook.cio.gov/)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	0	
9	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	
10	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	
11	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	
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 the description?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
15	Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
16	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	
			Technical Review Score:	25
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 content, including documents, user-configurable forms, tables, and workflows.	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 control 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	
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	0	
24	Does the Working Prototype trigger escalation processes (e.g., automated emails/texts to approvers, reminders) for lifecycle activities?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	0	
25	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?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
26	Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning from 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 < 3.5 = 0 pts	10	
30	Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) 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	
32	Code Coverage	> 85% = 5 pts > 75% = 3 pts > 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts	1	
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 IaaS 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., git, GitHub, svn)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
35	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	
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	
			Code Examination/Review Score:	29
			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 Repository Site: <https://github.com/ifiishgroup/pqvp-kmi>

Prototype Location:

Location of Accountants to Login to the Prototype:

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	
5	Is the user interface intuitive?	Very Intuitive = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	10	
6	Is the user interface easy to use?	Very Easy = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	15	
Admin Review Score:			25	
TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW				
7	Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words?	Yes = 5 pts; No = 0	5	
8	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	
9	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	
10	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	
11	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	
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 the description?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
15	Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
16	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	
Technical Review Score:			27	
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 content, 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 control 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 approvers, reminders) for lifecycle activities?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
25	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?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
26	Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning from 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 < 3.5 = 0 pts	10	
30	Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) 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	
32	Code Coverage	> 85% = 5 pts > 75% = 3 pts > 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts	5	
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 IaaS 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., git, GitHub, svn)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
35	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	
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	
Code Examination/Review Score:			33	
OVERALL SCORE:			95	

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 Repository Site: <https://github.com/watipqvp/CDT-PQVP-0118-WATI>

Prototype Location:

Location of Accountants to Login to the Prototype:

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	5	
5	Is the user interface intuitive?	Very Intuitive = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	5	
6	Is the user interface easy to use?	Very Easy = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	10	
Admin Review Score:			20	
TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW				
7	Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words?	Yes = 5 pts; No = 0	0	
8	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	
9	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	
10	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	
11	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	
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 the description?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
15	Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
16	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	
Technical Review Score:			22	
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 content, 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 control 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 approvers, reminders) for lifecycle activities?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
25	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?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
26	Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning from 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 < 3.5 = 0 pts	10	
30	Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) or Platform as a 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	
32	Code Coverage	> 85% = 5 pts > 75% = 3 pts > 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts	1	
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 IaaS 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., git, GitHub, svn)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
35	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	
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	
Code Examination/Review Score:			29	
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 Repository Site: https://github.com/adhawan-vip/vip_adpq/

Prototype Location: <https://vip-adpq.herokuapp.com/#/>

Location of Accounts to Login to the Prototype:

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	5	
5	Is the user interface intuitive?	Very Intuitive = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	10	
6	Is the user interface easy to use?	Very Easy = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	15	
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	
8	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	
9	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	
10	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	
11	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	
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 the description?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
15	Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
16	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	
Technical Review Score:			27	
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 content, 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 control 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 approvers, reminders) for lifecycle activities?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	0	
25	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?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	0	
26	Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning from 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	2	
Working Prototype Review Score:			7	
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 < 3.5 = 0 pts	10	
30	Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) 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	
32	Code Coverage	> 85% = 5 pts > 75% = 3 pts > 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts	3	
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 IaaS 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., git, GitHub, svn)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
35	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	
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	
Code Examination/Review Score:			31	
OVERALL SCORE:			95	

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 Repository Site: <https://github.com/xFusionTech/KMT>

Prototype Location: <http://ec2-18-144-75-92.us-west-1.compute.amazonaws.com:8088/>

Location of Accounts to Login to the Prototype:

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	5	
5	Is the user interface intuitive?	Very Intuitive = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	10	
6	Is the user interface easy to use?	Very Easy = 15 Somewhat Easy = 10 Somewhat Difficult = 5 Very Difficult = 0	15	
			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	
8	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	
9	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	
10	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	
11	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	
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 the description?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
15	Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
16	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	
			Technical Review Score:	27
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 content, 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 control 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 approvers, reminders) for lifecycle activities?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
25	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?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
26	Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning from 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 < 3.5 = 0 pts	10	
30	Does the description reference deploying the prototype on an Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) 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	
32	Code Coverage	> 85% = 5 pts > 75% = 3 pts > 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts	3	
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 IaaS 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. git, GitHub, svn)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
35	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	
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	
			Code Examination/Review Score:	31
			OVERALL SCORE:	98