**GAP Research Compendium Charter**

The GAP Research Compendium Charter is very skeleton in nature. The first thing that one would notice is that this is a “LITE” charter. On page 3 of the charter, it has the bullet points of a Lite template side-by-side with a full template. This charter only fulfills a small subset of the key elements outlined nt he next on page 38-41. It includes elements such as purpose, project/product overview, alternatives explored, scope of project (objectives, high-level requirements, major deliverables/milestones), duration/timeline, budget estimate, and charter approval. It is notably missing element such as key assumptions, constraints, and major risks. These missing elements are consistent with would have been expected based on the side by side comparison between lite and full charters.

As for the existing sections, the project purpose and title are very clear. It seems like there is a pressing need to be able to catalog various international research projects. The objectives section spells out exactly how and what type of data the project stakeholders would like to be able to process. However, the description of such a need is very high level and the funding section has no official funding source. The estimated timeline is incredibly aggressive because it goes from requirements generation to deployment in less than a two month time period. No real background information is provided as to whether they have an existing system that could essentially be ported over or whether they have to develop such a system from ground up.

Based on the information available in a lite charter, it seems these may be geared towards internal needs efforts and to gauge whether there will be internal customer buy-in as there is no existing funding source. If a customer is interested, they may wish that particular team to explore and expand the lite charter into a full charter. Based on my experience on software process tasks, I’ve seen internally funded small programs have software development plans in similar detail to this lite charter. Software development plans for larger programs with external customers usually require a much higher level of detail in its implementation and program risks.

**TOWNSHIP OF ROBBINSVILLE**

**REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OFQUALIFICATIONS AND PROPOSALS FOR IT CONSULTANT**

The Township of Robbinsville RFP for an IT consultant mirrors the basic elements expected of an RFP. It has a clear objective with a clear end state. The statement of work describes the duties and responsibilities of the IT consultant it is soliciting. The three major area of responsibilities include server/network devices, LAN services, and workstation maintenance. The scope of work is system admin and maintenance related activities, however, it leaves open the opportunity for enhancements and additional features outside of regular maintenance activities for an additional fee. The major requirements that the customer has to meet are generally legal and compliance oriented.

The most significant difference between this RFP and the example in the text is that this RFP is for services to be performed throughout a specific period of time versus deliverables at the end of the contract – service oriented instead of product oriented. Thus it makes acceptance criteria more difficult to quantify. Therefore, it makes sense that the township would need to perform due diligence and have bidders provide references. The township needs to thoroughly research the contractor’s work history and reputation. It is interesting they specifically want to know the last client the contractor has had that did not continue with follow-on services. The township has the greatest control over the outcome of this contract when it makes its assessment of the personnel each bidder puts forth. The township requires that those personnel pass background checks and security clearance requirements. The “good faith” clause is used frequently in this RFP perhaps due to the nature of for a service based RFP.

The funding for this contract is fixed cost for basic services with opportunities for additional features/enhancements under a time and materials based fee. The various suggested proposal formats include a section to address the hourly rate for these enhancements. The township informs the contractors that they may not be paid in full until 6 weeks after the township has been invoiced.

The period of performance for this contract is consistent with what would be expected for a serviced based RFP. In an agreement where products are not delivered consistently throughout the period of performance, the township should want shorter terms so if for some reason the services provided are not satisfactory, they can issue another RFP in a few months instead of a few years. However, this frequently cycle adds risk to the contractor’s business strategy and therefore, he must charge higher rates to cover this time risk. Another positive option for the RFP is now allowing the contractor to subcontract services. In a maintenance contract, subcontracting adds a layer that is unnecessary.