

## Vendor RFQ Evaluation Checklist & Scoring Framework

### 1. INITIAL COMPLIANCE CHECK (Pass/Fail - Must Pass All)

#### 1.1 Administrative Compliance

SNO	Criteria	Check	Score
1.1.1	RFQ submitted by deadline	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1.1.2	All required documents included	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1.1.3	Response format follows RFQ guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1.1.4	Non-disclosure agreement signed	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1.1.5	Insurance certificates provided (if required)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1.1.6	Financial statements submitted	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1.1.7	References provided (minimum 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1.1.8	Pricing clearly stated with no hidden costs	<input type="checkbox"/>	

#### 1.2 Mandatory Requirements

SNO	Criteria	Check	Score
1.2.1	Supports required HL7/FHIR versions	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1.2.2	Meets regulatory compliance (HIPAA, GDPR, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1.2.3	Available in required geography/regions	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1.2.4	Supports required integration protocols	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1.2.5	Meets minimum uptime SLA (typically 99.9%)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1.2.6	Disaster recovery capabilities documented	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**Decision Point:** If ANY mandatory item fails → Reject proposal

---

### 2. FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS (Weight: 35%)

#### Core Integration Capabilities (10 points each)

##### HL7 v2 Support

- ☐ 0 pts: Not supported
- ☐ 5 pts: Basic support (ADT, ORM, ORU)

- ☐ 10 pts: Comprehensive support (all message types, custom segments)

### **FHIR Implementation**

- ☐ 0 pts: Not supported
- ☐ 3 pts: FHIR R4 basic CRUD
- ☐ 7 pts: + Search parameters, operations
- ☐ 10 pts: + Subscriptions, bulk data, US Core profiles

### **Message Transformation**

- ☐ 0 pts: Manual coding required
- ☐ 5 pts: GUI-based mapping tools
- ☐ 8 pts: + Pre-built templates for common scenarios
- ☐ 10 pts: + AI-assisted mapping, testing framework

### **Data Validation & Quality**

- ☐ 0 pts: Basic schema validation only
- ☐ 5 pts: Business rule validation
- ☐ 8 pts: + Data quality scoring
- ☐ 10 pts: + Auto-correction, enrichment capabilities

### **Error Handling & Recovery**

- ☐ 0 pts: Basic error logging
- ☐ 5 pts: Retry mechanisms, dead letter queues
- ☐ 8 pts: + Automated recovery workflows
- ☐ 10 pts: + Predictive error prevention, root cause analysis

### **Routing & Orchestration**

- ☐ 0 pts: Point-to-point only
- ☐ 5 pts: Basic routing rules
- ☐ 8 pts: + Complex workflows, conditional routing
- ☐ 10 pts: + Event-driven architecture, choreography

**Total Functional Score:** \_\_\_\_ / 60 points

---

### **3. TECHNICAL CAPABILITIES** (Weight: 30%)

#### **Architecture & Scalability (5 points each)**

##### **System Architecture**

- ☐ 0 pts: Monolithic, single point of failure
- ☐ 3 pts: Basic redundancy
- ☐ 5 pts: Microservices, cloud-native, auto-scaling

##### **Performance & Throughput**

- ☐ 0 pts: <100 messages/sec
- ☐ 3 pts: 100-1000 messages/sec
- ☐ 5 pts: >1000 messages/sec with <2 sec latency

##### **API Management**

- ☐ 0 pts: Basic API exposure
- ☐ 3 pts: API gateway, rate limiting, versioning
- ☐ 5 pts: + Developer portal, analytics, monetization

##### **Integration Patterns**

- ☐ 0 pts: Synchronous only
- ☐ 3 pts: + Async messaging
- ☐ 5 pts: + Event streaming, SAGA pattern, CQRS

##### **Monitoring & Observability**

- ☐ 0 pts: Basic logs
- ☐ 3 pts: Metrics, dashboards, alerting
- ☐ 5 pts: + Distributed tracing, APM, AI anomaly detection

##### **DevOps & CI/CD**

- ☐ 0 pts: Manual deployment
- ☐ 3 pts: Automated deployment pipelines
- ☐ 5 pts: + GitOps, infrastructure as code, blue-green deployments

##### **Data Storage & Management**

- ☐ 0 pts: Proprietary storage only

- ☐ 3 pts: Standard databases supported
- ☐ 5 pts: + Multiple storage options, data lake integration

### **Standards Compliance**

- ☐ 0 pts: Proprietary formats
- ☐ 3 pts: HL7 v2, basic FHIR
- ☐ 5 pts: + US Core, IHE profiles, multiple IGs

**Total Technical Score:** \_\_\_\_ / 40 points

---

## **4. SECURITY & COMPLIANCE (Weight: 20%)**

### **Security Features (5 points each)**

#### **Authentication & Authorization**

- ☐ 0 pts: Basic auth only
- ☐ 3 pts: OAuth 2.0, role-based access
- ☐ 5 pts: + SMART on FHIR, attribute-based access, MFA

#### **Encryption & Data Protection**

- ☐ 0 pts: Transit encryption only
- ☐ 3 pts: + At-rest encryption
- ☐ 5 pts: + Key management, field-level encryption, tokenization

#### **Audit & Compliance**

- ☐ 0 pts: Basic logging
- ☐ 3 pts: Comprehensive audit trails
- ☐ 5 pts: + Tamper-proof logs, real-time alerts, automated compliance reports

#### **Regulatory Certifications**

- ☐ 0 pts: No certifications
- ☐ 3 pts: HIPAA compliant, security assessments
- ☐ 5 pts: + SOC 2, HITRUST, ISO 27001, FedRAMP

#### **Vulnerability Management**

- ☐ 0 pts: No formal process

- ☐ 3 pts: Regular patching, vulnerability scanning
- ☐ 5 pts: + Penetration testing, bug bounty, zero-day response plan

#### **Consent Management**

- ☐ 0 pts: Not supported
- ☐ 3 pts: Basic consent tracking
- ☐ 5 pts: + Granular consent, patient portal, consent workflow

#### **Data Privacy Controls**

- ☐ 0 pts: No specific controls
- ☐ 3 pts: Data minimization, anonymization
- ☐ 5 pts: + GDPR tools, right to erasure, privacy by design

#### **Network Security**

- ☐ 0 pts: Basic firewall
- ☐ 3 pts: VPC, private endpoints, WAF
- ☐ 5 pts: + Zero trust architecture, micro-segmentation, DDoS protection

**Total Security Score:** \_\_\_\_ / 40 points

---

### **5. VENDOR VIABILITY & SUPPORT (Weight: 10%)**

#### **Company Stability (3 points each)**

##### **Financial Stability**

- ☐ 0 pts: Startup, unproven
- ☐ 2 pts: Established but limited financials
- ☐ 3 pts: Publicly traded or strong VC backing, profitable

##### **Market Presence**

- ☐ 0 pts: <5 customers
- ☐ 2 pts: 5-50 customers
- ☐ 3 pts: >50 customers, recognized analyst coverage (Gartner, KLAS)

##### **Healthcare Experience**

- ☐ 0 pts: No healthcare clients

- ☐ 2 pts: Some healthcare implementations
- ☐ 3 pts: Majority healthcare clients, industry partnerships

### **Product Roadmap**

- ☐ 0 pts: No clear roadmap
- ☐ 2 pts: 12-month roadmap shared
- ☐ 3 pts: Multi-year vision, customer input process

### **Support & SLA**

- ☐ 0 pts: Email support only
- ☐ 2 pts: 8x5 phone support
- ☐ 3 pts: 24x7 support, dedicated TAM, <1 hour critical response

### **Training & Documentation**

- ☐ 0 pts: Limited documentation
- ☐ 2 pts: User guides, online training
- ☐ 3 pts: + Certification programs, video library, knowledge base

### **Implementation Services**

- ☐ 0 pts: Self-service only
- ☐ 2 pts: Professional services available
- ☐ 3 pts: + Proven methodology, accelerators, partner ecosystem

### **Community & Ecosystem**

- ☐ 0 pts: Closed system
- ☐ 2 pts: API documentation, developer support
- ☐ 3 pts: + Active community, marketplace, extensibility platform

**Total Vendor Score:** \_\_\_\_ / 24 points

---

## **6. COMMERCIAL TERMS (Weight: 5%)**

### **Pricing & TCO (4 points each)**

#### **Pricing Model**

- ☐ 0 pts: Unclear or complex pricing

- [ ] 2 pts: Transparent, volume-based
- [ ] 4 pts: + Flexible options (transaction, subscription, enterprise)

#### **Total Cost of Ownership**

- [ ] 0 pts: High hidden costs (training, maintenance, upgrades)
- [ ] 2 pts: Moderate additional costs
- [ ] 4 pts: All-inclusive pricing, no surprise fees

#### **Contract Terms**

- [ ] 0 pts: Inflexible, long lock-in
- [ ] 2 pts: Standard 3-year term
- [ ] 4 pts: + Flexible terms, opt-out clauses, performance guarantees

#### **Value for Money**

- [ ] 0 pts: Significantly above market rate
- [ ] 2 pts: Market rate
- [ ] 4 pts: Competitive pricing with superior features

**Total Commercial Score:** \_\_\_\_ / 16 points

---

### **TOTAL SCORING SUMMARY**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Raw Score</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>
Functional Requirements	____ / 60	35%	_____
Technical Capabilities	____ / 40	30%	_____
Security & Compliance	____ / 40	20%	_____
Vendor Viability	____ / 24	10%	____
Commercial Terms	____ / 16	5%	____
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>100%</b>	____

#### **Scoring Interpretation:**

- **90-100:** Excellent - Highly recommended
- **80-89:** Good - Recommended with minor reservations

- **70-79:** Acceptable - Significant gaps to address
  - **60-69:** Marginal - High risk, extensive negotiation required
  - **<60:** Not recommended
- 

## 7. RISK ASSESSMENT

### Technical Risks

- [ ] **Low:** Proven technology, mature product
- [ ] **Medium:** Some gaps, workarounds needed
- [ ] **High:** Significant technical debt or limitations

### Implementation Risks

- [ ] **Low:** Clear methodology, experienced team
- [ ] **Medium:** Limited experience in similar projects
- [ ] **High:** Unproven in healthcare or scale

### Vendor Risks

- [ ] **Low:** Established company, strong financials
- [ ] **Medium:** Growth company, adequate backing
- [ ] **High:** Startup, financial concerns

### Integration Risks

- [ ] **Low:** Standard interfaces, pre-built connectors
  - [ ] **Medium:** Custom development required
  - [ ] **High:** Complex integration, multiple dependencies
- 

## 8. REFERENCE CHECKS

Contact at least 3 references per vendor:

### Questions to Ask:

1. How long have you been using the solution?
2. What was your implementation timeline vs. promised?
3. Rate support responsiveness (1-5):



4. Have you experienced any major outages?
5. How well does it scale with volume growth?
6. Any hidden costs or surprises?
7. Would you choose this vendor again? (Yes/No)
8. What are the top 3 strengths?
9. What are the top 3 weaknesses?
10. Rate overall satisfaction (1-5):

**Reference Score:** Average of all ratings

---

## **9. DEMONSTRATION EVALUATION**

### **Demo Scorecard (During Technical Presentation)**

#### **Preparation & Professionalism (5 points)**

- ☐ Well-prepared, relevant use cases
- ☐ Team expertise demonstrated
- ☐ Understood our requirements

#### **Live System Demonstration (10 points)**

- ☐ Real product (not slides/mockups)
- ☐ Showed key required features
- ☐ System performed well (no crashes/errors)
- ☐ Realistic data and scenarios

#### **Question Handling (5 points)**

- ☐ Answered questions confidently
- ☐ Honest about limitations
- ☐ Provided workarounds where needed

**Total Demo Score:** \_\_\_\_ / 20 points

---

## **10. FINAL RECOMMENDATION TEMPLATE**

**Recommended Vendor:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Overall Score:** \_\_\_\_ / 100

**Key Strengths:** 1. 2. 3.

**Key Concerns:** 1. 2. 3.

**Mitigation Strategies:**

- 
- 

**Contract Negotiation Priorities:** 1. 2. 3.

**Implementation Risks:**

- Risk: \_\_\_\_\_ | Mitigation: \_\_\_\_\_
- Risk: \_\_\_\_\_ | Mitigation: \_\_\_\_\_

**Recommendation:** [ ☐ ] Approve [ ☐ ] Approve with Conditions [ ☐ ] Reject

**Sign-off:**

- Solution Architect: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- Technical Lead: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- Security Officer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- Procurement: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_