

CUSTOM DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION FORM

Vendor Evaluation Checklist: SmartCare HMIS Modernization

Project Goal: To evaluate and select a consultant or firm to lead the refactoring of the Kijabe Hospital SmartCare HMIS from a legacy ASP.NET WebForms application to a modern, secure, and scalable platform using .NET Core and Blazor, incorporating features outlined in the technology roadmap.

Vendor / Firm Name:	
Date of Meeting:	
Evaluator(s):	

Instructions:

Evaluate the vendor on each statement below using the provided 5-point Likert scale. Circle the number that best reflects your assessment. Use the comments section to provide specific evidence, notes, or red flags discussed during the meeting.

Rating Scale:

- **1** = Strongly Disagree / Very Poor
- **2** = Disagree / Poor
- **3** = Neutral / Average
- **4** = Agree / Good
- **5** = Strongly Agree / Excellent
- **N/A** = Not Assessed / Not Applicable

A. Project Understanding & Domain Knowledge

This section assesses the vendor's grasp of the project's unique context and challenges based on the HMIS Challenges Report.

Statement	Rating
1. The vendor demonstrated a clear understanding of the current system's	1 2 3 4 5 N/A

technology debt (e.g., outdated .NET Framework, WebForms, jQuery).	
2. The vendor accurately summarized the project's strategic goals (e.g., modernization, improved security, scalability).	1 2 3 4 5 N/A
3. The vendor showed strong expertise in relevant healthcare standards, including the migration from HL7 v2 to HL7 FHIR.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A
4. The vendor recognized the unique operational challenges of a live hospital environment and the need to minimize disruption.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A

Section A Comments:

B. Technical Methodology & Approach

This section evaluates the credibility and soundness of the vendor's proposed technical plan.

Statement	Rating
1. The vendor presented a clear, credible, and well-defined methodology for refactoring the application from ASP.NET WebForms to .NET Core/Blazor.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A
2. The proposed approach for decoupling business logic from forms and creating a	1 2 3 4 5 N/A

modern, service-oriented architecture is sound.	
3. The vendor's plan for the UI/UX redesign is convincing and aligns with our goal for a modern, maintainable user experience.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A
4. The vendor has a clear strategy for a phased migration to minimize risk and downtime, as opposed to a "big bang" rewrite.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A

Section B Comments:

C. Security & Compliance Strategy

This section assesses the vendor's ability to address the critical security flaws identified in the Security Audit.

Statement	Rating
1. The vendor provided a confident and specific plan to remediate the identified security vulnerabilities (SQL Injection, insecure deserialization, etc.).	1 2 3 4 5 N/A
2. The vendor's approach to implementing parameterized queries to fix SQL injection is aligned with best practices.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A
3. The vendor demonstrated a strong commitment to data security and privacy	1 2 3 4 5 N/A

principles appropriate for sensitive patient data.	
4. The vendor's plan for implementing Two-Factor Authentication (2FA) is clear and technically sound.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A

Section C Comments:

D. Future-Proofing & Roadmap Alignment

This section evaluates if the vendor's solution will be scalable and support future hospital goals as per the Technology Roadmap.

Statement	Rating
1. The proposed architecture appears scalable and capable of supporting future roadmap features (AI/ML, DICOM integration, Smart Documentation).	1 2 3 4 5 N/A
2. The vendor agrees that a modern, service-oriented foundation is a prerequisite for advanced capabilities like AI/ML.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A
3. The vendor presented a viable approach for viewer-level imaging integration and interfacing with external PACS systems.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A
4. The vendor has relevant ideas or experience in implementing "Smart	1 2 3 4 5 N/A

Documentation" features (NLP, Voice-to-Text, etc.).	
---	--

Section D Comments:

E. Project Management & Collaboration

This section assesses the working relationship and process.

Statement	Rating
1. The vendor’s project management methodology (e.g., Agile/Scrum) is well-defined and suits our needs.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A
2. The plan for communication, stakeholder engagement, and progress reporting is transparent and frequent.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A
3. The vendor has a clear plan for knowledge transfer to ensure our internal team can maintain the system post-launch.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A
4. The vendor appears to be a collaborative partner rather than just a contractor.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A

Section E Comments:

F. Cost & Commercials

This section evaluates the financial aspects of the proposal.

Statement	Rating
1. The vendor provided a clear, detailed, and transparent cost breakdown for the entire project.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A
2. The proposed Total Cost of Ownership (TCO), including licensing and initial investment, appears reasonable for the value offered.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A
3. The post-launch support and maintenance costs (Annual Maintenance Cost - AMC) are clearly defined and seem sustainable.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A
4. The proposed timeline aligns with our expectation of approximately 18 months.	1 2 3 4 5 N/A

Section F Comments:

Summary & Final Recommendation

Key Strengths:

Key Risks / Concerns:

Recommendation:

(Circle one)

Highly Recommend (Proceed to next stage)

Recommend with Reservations (Concerns to be addressed)

Do Not Recommend

Comments

- 1. Online document**
- 2. Combine teams**
- 3. Look at each proposal**