

David Wilson, Inc.

Software Subcontract Proposal Evaluation Procedure

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to guide the evaluation of software contract proposals according to the Software Engineering Institute's Software Capability Evaluation method. Following this procedure ensures the fair and unbiased assessment of all proposals and that partners are selected for an optimal cross-section of capability and efficiency.

Scope

This procedure shall be employed for each Request for Proposal (RFP) published by the company in response to a need for subcontract work on a company software project. It shall be initiated by the project manager or a designated member of the project's development team, who shall henceforth be referred to as the "evaluation team leader." All members of the evaluation team formed in Step 1 of the procedure shall assume responsibility for conducting the rest of the procedure.

Prerequisites

Before initiating this procedure, the evaluation team leader shall gather the most recent versions of each of the following documents where applicable to the project and each proposing firm:

- The associated RFP
- The associated evaluation plans
- All proposals submitted in response to the RFP
- All prior performance records related to the proposing firms

Responsibilities

The Technical Editing team leader holds responsibilities for the maintenance and accuracy of this document. Evaluation team leaders hold responsibility for reviewing and executing this procedure.

Procedure

Follow each of these steps in order to enact the Software Subcontract Proposal Evaluation Procedure:

1. Select the members of the evaluation team.
 - a. Select prospective members on their prior knowledge and experience in topic areas and technologies advertised in the RFP.
 - b. Up to two external consultants may be selected with prior approval from senior management. Contact Accounting to prepare each of the following documents prior to sharing any proprietary information with an external consultant:
 - i. Consulting Agreement
 - ii. Non-Disclosure Agreement

2. Hold an evaluation team training meeting.
 - a. All members of the evaluation team shall sign a routine form acknowledging their attendance of this meeting and their agreement to objectively evaluate proposals and proposing firms according to the requirements established in the evaluation plan.
 - b. Training meeting details may vary, but all meetings shall include at least the following:
 - i. Overview of the project and its top-level requirements
 - ii. Thorough review of the evaluation plan
 - iii. Review of effective interview and inspection techniques
3. Conduct the initial proposal qualifier review.
 - a. Reject all proposals not meeting the elementary requirements for formatting, content, relevance, or other basic criteria.
4. Conduct the technical proposal evaluation.
 - a. Score each proposal against the criteria established in the evaluation plan.
 - b. Tabulate a total score for each proposal.
 - c. Reject all proposals with a total score lower than 90.
5. Schedule in-person presentations with remaining proposing firms.
 - a. Send out presentation requests within 14 days of the RFP's closure.
 - b. Hold all presentations within 45 days of the RFP's closure.
6. Review in-person presentations.
 - a. At least two-thirds of the evaluation team shall attend each presentation.
 - b. Take special note of the following criteria during the presentation review:
 - i. The prior experience of the proposing firm in the subject area
 - ii. The prior experience of key personnel in the subject area
 - iii. Facilities and assets available to the proposing firm that are relevant to the subject area, including unique proprietary tools
 - iv. Knowledge of the subject area demonstrated in the presentation
7. Hold follow-up evaluation team meeting.
 - a. Select proposing firms to move into the interview phase based on their presentations.
 - b. Schedule interviews with at least one member of key personnel from each selected firm.
8. Prepare interview questions.
 - a. As a team, generate a list of general interview questions for the process as a whole.
 - b. You may also generate specific interview questions for each interview conducted.
 - c. Interview questions shall focus on exploring the following topics:
 - i. Supporting personnel that will work on the project
 - ii. Facilities and assets used to support the operation
 - iii. Prior work conducted by the firm or key personnel in the subject area
 - iv. Proprietary tools or operations reviewed in the presentation

- v. Knowledge of the state of the art within the subject area
9. Conduct interviews.
 - a. Conduct all interviews within 60 days of the RFP's closure.
 - b. Record all interviews for later review.
10. Consolidate evaluation data.
 - a. Gather all data about remaining proposing firms that was collected or developed as part of the evaluation process before holding the final meeting. This should include at least the following items:
 - i. Proposals
 - ii. Presentations
 - iii. Copies of interviews and related materials
 - iv. Prior performance records related to the proposing firms
 - v. Any other supporting documents provided by the proposing firms, including resumes, software descriptions, and other information
11. Hold the final evaluation team meeting.
 - a. As a team, select no more than five proposing firms to advance to final evaluations.
 - b. Score the selected teams with final evaluation ratings based on the final weighted evaluation criteria established in the evaluation plan.
12. Prepare the final evaluation report.
 - a. Use this report to summarize the final evaluation scores of each firm selected in the final evaluation team meeting.
13. Submit the final evaluation report to senior management.
 - a. Also submit a copy of all consolidated evaluation data related to the firms discussed in the report.
 - b. Submit final evaluation reports within 90 days of the RFP's closure.
 - c. Senior management shall make a final selection within 100 days of the RFP's closure.

References

- Byrnes. Paul, and Phillips. Michael, "Software Capability Evaluation Version 3.0 Method Description," Software Engineering Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Technical Report CMU/SEI-96-TR-002, 1996.
<http://resources.sei.cmu.edu/library/asset-view.cfm?AssetID=12503>

Revision History

| Date | Name | Purpose |
|------------|--------------|-------------|
| 01/26/2021 | David Wilson | First Draft |
| | | |