**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.

* + **Analyze ONE of the following RFPs (Note: you may have to cut and paste the URL into your browser):**

<http://www.robbinsville-twp.org/ccs_files/documents/RFP/IT%20RFP%20July%202013-Dec%202013-1.pdf>

<http://www.phila.gov/rfp/Documents/Marathon%20RFP%202014%20Graphic%20Web%20Design%20Consultant%20-%2022014%20edits.pdf>

<http://www.ucmo.edu/procurement/documents/RFP9297ProjectManagementSoftwareSystem.pdf>

* + - **Evaluate the one you choose as follows:**
      * **How does the contents compare to the RFP requirements contained in the text and Figure 2.3?**
      * **State good points, bad points, and any comments you might have from the bidder’s point of view.**
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