RFP Response – Vendor Comparison

The KM business requirements included within this document are segmented within the below groups.

General
Create / Change Knowledge
Search /Retrieve Knowledge
View / Interact Knowledge
Manage / Distribute Knowledge
Report Knowledge
Store Knowledge
Secure Knowledge
Performance
Technical & Integration
Support

Vendor Comparison Analysis – Final Round – Top Two of Short List

1. The Vendors included within this RFP Comparison include: Two KM Vendors.
2. All business requirements included in the Knowledge Management RFP Template are incorporated in this comparison.
3. The comparison assessment criteria embrace the vendor's:
   a. Comprehension of the business requirement and context of their use within the client.
   b. Understanding of service desk /help desk business processes and activities.
   c. Fulfillment of business requirements, as stated.
   d. Current availability of the business requirement.
4. The assessment of each individual business requirement for KM Vendor 1 and KM Vendor 2 may result in one vendor being viewed as having an advantage. For the vendor identified with an advantage, the word **ADVANTAGE** is annotated in the particular assessment column cell.
5. Specific business requirements have been identified as 'high priority' for use within the client's business environment. These 'high priority' requirements are highlighted with a gray shade in the particular vendor assessment columns/cells.
6. All business requirements sections are totaled for both the total and the number of 'high priority' cells recorded for each vendor. (two totals) A weight is recorded for each individual requirement based upon the strength of the **ADVANTAGE**, 1-5, with 5 the highest value.
7. The summary sheet provides a summation of the ten individual business requirement assessments.
8. This vendor comparison represents only one element of the selection process for a suitable KM solution.
9. The vendor receiving the highest score does not necessarily have an advantage in the overall selection process.

Vendor Comparison - RECAP

Business Requirement	KM Vendor 1		KM Vendor 2	
	Advantage	Score	Advantage	Score
1. General	**3**	**60**	**0**	**52**
2. Create / Change Knowledge	**4**	**174**	**1**	**170**
3. Search /Retrieve Knowledge	**8**	**138**	**4**	**139**
4. View / Interact Knowledge	**1**	**64**	**2**	**63**
5. Manage / Distribute Knowledge	**0**	**77**	**2**	**82**
6. Report Knowledge	**1**	**75**	**2**	**77**
7. Store Knowledge	**2**	**39**	**0**	**36**
8. Secure Knowledge	**5**	**50**	**1**	**41**
9. Performance	**0**	**60**	**0**	**60**
10. Technical & Integration	**0**	**80**	**0**	**80**
11. Support	**2**	**83**	**0**	**73**

© 2005 – The Knowledge Compass, Inc. – www.knowledgecompass.com – All Rights Reserved

Totals	26	900	12	873

2. Create / Change Knowledge (Example from above)

Ref #	Requirement	KM Vendor 1		KM Vendor 2	
		Advantage	Score	Advantage	Score
2.1	Multi-lingual content creation capability.		5		5
2.2	Taxonomy to provide formal structure to categorize / index all documents in knowledge base.		5		5
	a) Categorize 'solution types' for storage and viewing.		5		5
2.3	Knowledge document types:				
	a) FAQs		5		5
	b) Knowledge Article – created from incident/problem ticket.		5		5
	c) Knowledge Article – created from employee experiences.		5		5
	d) Knowledge reference – tips and tricks		5		5
	e) Knowledge reference – seamless desktop access to technical and business manuals, bulletins etc.		5		5
	f) Glossary – define terms, acronyms, and concepts.		5		5
2.4	Support a knowledge lifecycle that transacts incident control to problem control to error control in alignment and compliant with OGC ITIL Assessment Criteria.		4		4
2.5	Automated knowledge authoring process:				
	a) User configurable graphical workflows – users create (or changes) knowledge articles and submit them for review, approval, and publish.		5		5
	b) User configurable authoring templates		5		5
	c) Workflows queues – identify status of documents in the workflow		5		5
	d) Document check-in /out check out	Advantage	5		0
	e) In-Boxes for authors, editors and approvers		5		5
	f) Drag and drop from existing sources of information	Advantage	5		3
	g) Notifications		3		3
	h) Promote / demote options		5		5
	i) Version control / history		5		5
	j) Track changes between version		5		5
2.6	Knowledge Article authoring tools				
	a) Text and image content processing		5		5
	b) Attachments to internal and external document sources		5		5
	c) Rich text authoring		5		5
	d) MS/HTML compatible		5		5
	e) Author / editor comment fields – displayed or hidden		5		5
	f) Customizable Thesaurus	Advantage	5		3
	g) Spell checking		5		5
	h) Term weighting		5		5
	i) Dynamic indexing		5		5
	j) Data and time stamped		5		5
	k) Auto-population	Advantage	5		3
	l) Content reuse		5		5
	m) Link to external documents in MS Word, MS EXCEL, Images, HTML, URLs etc.		5		5
2.7	Quality assurance process so new Knowledge Articles can be reviewed, edited, and approved before being moved into the knowledge base.		5		5
2.8	Auto-suggest of incidents / problems to convert into re-usable resolution answers (Knowledge Articles)		3	Advantage	5
2.9	Self-serving authoring facility for non-technical individuals using standard MS desktop applications.		5		5
2.10	Pop-up guides to guide users through creating and changing knowledge.		4		4
Score		4	174	1	170

This document is an example of a KM Solution RFP Vendor Comparison created for a client implementation with select pages included for viewing. Please contact Kevin M. O'Sullivan – ko@knowledgecompass.com for additional information on KMS implementation services.

© 2005 – The Knowledge Compass, Inc. – www.knowledgecompass.com – All Rights Reserved