SCORING METHODOL	-OGY*
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

<sup>\*</sup>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
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	15	
3	is the user interrace intuitive?	Somewhat Difficult = 5	15	
		Very Difficult = 0		
		Very Easy = 15		
6	is the user interface easy to use?	Somewhat Easy = 10	15	
U	is the user interrace easy to use?	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	
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 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	
	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	
	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	
	Wo	orking 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 (laas) or Platform as Service (Paas) provider, and indicate which provider they used?	< 3.5 = 0 pts Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
	Does the description interence the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and interest the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
٠.	excess the description for the destroit of this could find the description thorough and thousand the control of the country of	> 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. cit. (cit.Hub,svn)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
	Does the description of continuous integration reterence use or a configuration management tool? (e.g., gir, ourbus,svn)  Does the description reference 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	
			2	
	Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
30	Are the prototype and underlying platforms used to create and run the prototype openly licensed and free of charge?	yes = 2 pts; No = 0 ode Examination/Review Score:		
		OVERALL SCORE:		
		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
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	10	
is the user interface intuitive?	Somewhat Difficult = 5	10	
	Very Difficult = 0		
	Very Easy = 15		
	Somewhat Easy = 10		
Is the user interface easy to use?	Somewhat Difficult = 5	15	
	Very Difficult = 0		
	Admin Review Score:	30	
TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW	Admin Review Score.	30	
Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words?	Yes = 5 pts: No = 0	5	
I loss the vericor's rectification make reference to the US Digital Services playbook in their response? (see https://playbook.cio.gov)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
be the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the quality of the prototype submitted?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
be sub-user 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	
Uboes the description make reterence to a team that includes, at a minimum, rive (s) of the labor categories as identified in the RF1?    Does the description reference human centered design techniques/Rodos?		2	
	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
	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	
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	
17 Does the description make reference to performing usability tests with people?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
8 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			
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 be the working Prototype have the ability to easily cleate knowledge attacks (KAS)? (These can be drighted records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and/or packages or centent, including documents, user-configurable forms, tables, and workflows.	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
20 Does the Working Prototyce 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	
25 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	
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?	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	
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	1	
7 Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	0	
	Vorking 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	
	> 3.5 = 10 pts		
29 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	
		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		
2 Code Coverage	> 75% = 3 pts	1	
	> 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	
4 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	
16 Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
To Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
Does the description describe now to install and run their prototype on another environment.  Does the description describe now to install and run their prototype on another environment.  Also the run description describe now to install and run their prototype openly licensed and free of charge?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
	Code Examination/Review Score:  OVERALL SCORE:	29	
		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

	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	
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	10	
U	is the user interface easy to use?	Somewhat Difficult = 5	10	
		Very Difficult = 0		
		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	
	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	
	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	
	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	
	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 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	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	
	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	0	
27	Does the Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
		rking 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	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	
		> 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. qit, 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	
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	
	Co	de Examination/Review Score:		
		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:

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	
ls 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	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  Admin Review Score:	0.5	
TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW	Admin Review Score:	25	
7 Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words?	Yes = 5 pts; No = 0	5	
Is the versions recriminal Approach institute under 2,000 words?    Southern Continued and the properties of the propert	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	
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			
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 or the 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 or the 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 or the 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 or the 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 or the prototype have the ability to easily create "knowledge articles" (KAs)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) and or the prototype have the pr	of centent, including documents, user- Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
configurable forms, tables, and workflows.			
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 juni		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	
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)?		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	
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	
PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW	Working Prototype Review Score:	10	
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	
20 Double describe of the desc	< 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	
21 Booth developing of control to the control of collection for the booth and and in the developing the control of collection developing.	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?	> 85% = 5 pts > 75% = 3 pts		
		1	
	> 65% = 1 pt	1	
32 Code Coverage	> 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts	·	
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 provided to a	> 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts ider? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
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 PaaS provided to Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g., git, GitHub,sym)	> 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts ider? Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2 2	
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 provides the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. git, GitHub,svn)  Does the description reference continuous monitoring:	> 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts Ves = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2 2 2 2	
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 provide Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g., qit, GitHub,svn)  Does the description reference continuous monitoring?  Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization)	> 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2 2 2 2 2 2 2	
Code Coverage  Code Code Code Code Code Code Code Code	> 65% = 1 pt	2 2 2 2 2 2	
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 provided to Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g., git, GitHub,svn)  Does the description reference continuous monitoring?  Does the description reference deploying their software in a container (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization)	> 65% = 1 pt < 64.9% = 0 pts Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	

# 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	
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		
	Somewhat Easy = 10	_	
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		
TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW	Admin Review Score:	15	
	V FN- 0	5	
Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2.000 words?  Boes 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 Liquital Services piaybook in their responser (see https://playbook.cio.gov)  Does the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility for the quality of the quality of the profit only the profit of t	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
		2	
	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
	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	
3 Does the description reference a design style guide and/or pattern library?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
4 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		
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	
B 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 documen conflict	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	
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 undate and improve KAs and access the value of usage as input to prediction new records or record types?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
Does the Working Prototype show innovation by learning form existing records (e.g., typesa, content, usage) and prompting to create new KAs?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
be Describe Working Prototype include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above?  7 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 diseruration clearing reactive above?	Working Prototype Review Score:		
PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW	**Orking Prototype Review Score:	10	
	V O-t N	2	
Is there evidence that the provided code supports the functionality of the prototype?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0		
9 Code Climate Score	> 3.5 = 10 pts	0	
	< 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 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		
	> 85% = 5 pts		
32 Code Coverage	> 75% = 3 pts	0	
- Code Constage	> 65% = 1 pt	0	
	< 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	
4 Does the description of continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. qit. Gilthlus syn)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
5 Does the description reference continuous monitoring?  5 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	
	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
7 Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment?			
77 Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? 8 Age the prototype and underlying halfarons used to create and run the prototype prototype and underlying halfarons used to create and run the prototype prototype and underlying halfarons.		2	
77 Does the description describe how to install and run their prototype on another environment? 88 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:	2 16	

## 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
	s 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	
	s 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 I	s the user interface intuitive?	Somewhat Easy = 10	15	
	o the dest mention	Somewhat Difficult = 5	.0	
		Very Difficult = 0		
		Very Easy = 15		
6 I:	is the user interface easy to use?	Somewhat Easy = 10	15	
		Somewhat Difficult = 5	1.0	
		Very Difficult = 0		
	TECHNICAL APPROACH REVIEW	Admin Review Score:	35	
7 1	s the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words?	Yes = 5 pts; No = 0	0	
	s the vendor's Tedinical Approach Twalfarev gives 2,000 words?  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 supermetal responsioning, 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 prototyce 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	2	
		Technical Review Score:	22	
	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	
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	
	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	0	
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:	9	
00 1	PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW			
28 I:	s 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	
30 E	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?	< 3.5 = 0 pts Yes = 2 pts: No = 0	2	
	Does the description reference deploying the prototype of an initiastructure as a Service (tass) or Hattorina is service (trads) provider, and indicate which provider they describe the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description inference the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description information and understandable?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
31 L	and discomption reference the discontinuous for this code, and is the description thorough and understandable?	> 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 magnement tool? (e.g. oit, GitHub, san)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
	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 reterribe down to install and run their prototype on another environment?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
	Does the description describe flow to install a fund in the prototype on animal entrollments of the prototype on animal entrollment of	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
		de 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	
	V FN- 0	5	
7 Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words? 8 IDoes the description make reference to the US Didtal Services olavbook in their response? (see https://playbook.cio.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 response? (see intbs://playbook.cio.gov)      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	
bots the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility to the produces southered?    Does the description make reference to a single leader with the responsibility to the produces so identified in the RF1?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
to bos the description make reference burnar centered design techniques/tools?  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 retieval the use of the tools and is it consistent with the description, as dest as you can ten?  13 Does the prototype retieval the use of the tools and is it consistent with the description as dest as you can ten?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
to Does the description retretice a design style guide and/or pattern library and is it consistent with the description?  10 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 produppe fellera tire use or useant style (b) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies?    Does 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 review to doing an execute approach, more recoded an amounted decomption with.	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	r		
19 Does not working Prototype have the abouty to easily create. Nowledge attacks (KAS)? (These can be drighted records (E.g., Specific work instructions of content) about packages of certifiert, including documents, using 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 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	
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 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	
out or order	> 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. qit, 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 Fata 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://blaybook.cjo.gov)	Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
Does the description make reference to the US Liquital Services piaybook in their response? (see https://biaybook.cib.doy/      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	
both 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	
to best the description make reterince to a team that includes, at a minimum, tive (s) of the labor categories as identified in the KF1?    Does the description make reterince to a team that includes, at a minimum, tive (s) of the labor categories as identified in the KF1?    Does the description make reterince to a team that includes, at a minimum, tive (s) of the labor categories as identified in the KF1?    Does the description reference human centered design techniques/holls?	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 photographe relinea, the use of the tours 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 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	
17 Does the produppe telect use on uses in user under anothe patient unity and is a client side web technologies?  18 Does the description reference at least five (5) modern and open source frontend or client side web technologies?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
to be the prototype reflect the use of at least five (5) modern and upen 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 restricted to doing an increase of minor received minor decomption 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-			
19 Does the virtual prototype have the ability to easily cleate. Knowledge articles (AAS)? (These can be original records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) article profits ability of 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	
Out of children store	< 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 Coverage	> 75% = 3 pts	5	
Le louie coverage	> 65% = 1 pt	5	
	< 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	
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	
	ode Examination/Review Score:	33	
	OVERALL 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	
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	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	
7				
8	Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words?  Does the description make reference to the US Diolat Services playbook in their response? (see https://blaybook.cio.gov)	Yes = 5 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	0 2	
9	Liboes the description make reference to the US Digital Services playbook in their response? (see https://playbook.co.gov)  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 same 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 identified in the RF1?		2	
11	Does the description make reference to a team that includes, at a minimum, five (5) of the labor categories as identified in the RF1?  Does the description reference human centered design techniques/tools?  Does 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?  Does the description reference a design style quide and/or pattern library?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
14			2	
15	Does the prototype reflect the use of design style quide and/or pattern library and is it consistent with the description?    Does the description settlement and the pattern library and is it consistent with the description?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	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	Loos the description make reterence to performing ussainty tests with people?  Does the description make reference to using an iterative approach, where feedback informed and influenced subsequent work?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
10	boes the description make releasing to using an relative approach, where regulated informed and influenced 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	December of the Working Troutype have the about the damp of each whole according to the Working and the Configuration of the Working and the Configuration of the Working and	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 roley beased 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	
	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 tridger escalation processes (e.g., automated emails/texts to approses, reminders) for lifecycle activities?	Yes = 1 pts; No = 0	1	
	Does the Working Prototype Ingger escalation processes (e.g., additionated attribusives as of approved activities?  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 have the atomy to update and improve KAS and access the value of usage as improve to predicting the records of the record (specific prototype).  Does the Working Prototype have inner atomy to update and improve KAS and access the value of usage as improve to predicting the records (specific prototype).  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 include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
21		rking Prototype Review Score:		
	PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW	rking i rototype neview ocore.	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 reference the creation of unit tests for their code, and is the description thorough and understandable?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
	and the description reference the destroin or aim tests for their Code, and is the description thorough and dispersional decision.	> 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	Loos the description provide a description of the continuous integration process used to automate the running or 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., cit, GitHub,svn)	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
	Does the description or continuous integration reference use of a configuration management tool? (e.g. gir, sithup,syn)  Does the description or continuous monitoring?  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			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	
υO		Yes = 2 pts; No = 0 de Examination/Review Score:		
	Co	OVERALL 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/#/

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		
Is the user interface intuitive?	Somewhat Easy = 10	10	
Is the user interface intuitive?	Somewhat Difficult = 5	10	
	Very Difficult = 0		
	Very Easy = 15		
Is the user interface easy to use?	Somewhat Easy = 10	15	
	Somewhat Difficult = 5	13	
	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	
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 quide and/or pattern library?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
4 Does the prototype reflect the use of design style quide 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	
6 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	
8 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	reclinical Neview Score.	21	
Dece the Working Protecting have the chility to easily greate "grounded a stigled" (VAN) /Those can be existed recorded to a specific year including a content) and/or produces of content including documents.			
Does the working Prototype have the ability to easily cleate, knowledge afficies (KAS)? (These can be drighted records (e.g., specific work instructions or content) about packages or 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 junjor/non-technical staff)?	Yes = 1 pts: No = 0	1	
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	0	
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	0	
6 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	
7 Does the Working Prototyce include any other useful and/or creative features not mentioned above?	Yes = 2 pts; No = 0	2	
	orking Prototype Review Score:	7	
PROTOTYPE CODE EXAMINATION/REVIEW			
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 Culmate 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	
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	3	
- Coud Coverage	> 65% = 1 pt	3	
	< 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	
5 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	
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	
	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
	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	
	Is the user interface intuitive?	Very Intuitive = 15		
5		Somewhat Easy = 10	10	
-	to the dest interior individual to	Somewhat Difficult = 5	.0	
		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:	30	
7	Is the Vendor's Technical Approach Narrative under 2,000 words?	Yes = 5 pts; No = 0	5	
	Is the vention's Levinical Applicacin Natinative times 2,000 winds?  Does the description make reference to the US Digital Services playbook in their response? (see https://playbook.cip.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 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/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	
	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	
	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	
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	
		rking 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 (laas) or Platform as Service (Paas) provider, and indicate which provider they used?	< 3.5 = 0 pts 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 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	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. 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	
		de Examination/Review Score:		
		OVERALL SCORE:	98	