



Table 3a: CPIC Technical Panel Review Criteria and Suggested Scores Mandatory Reference for ADS Chapter 577

Revision Date: 07/14/05
Responsible Office: M/MPPA
File Name: 577mah_071405

* An asterisk indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised

Acronym	Meaning
COTS	Commercial-off-the-Shelf
CPIC	Capital Planning and Investment Control
DK	Don't Know
EA	Enterprise Architecture
IT	Information Technology
M/IRM	USAID Bureau for Management, Office of Information Resources Management
N/A	Not Applicable
NPV	Net Present Value
PIA	Privacy Impact Assessment
PM	Project Management
PMP	Project Management Professional
ROI	Return on Investment
USAID	US Agency for International Development
Y/N	Yes/No

* An asterisk indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised

Table 3a. CPIC TECHNICAL PANEL REVIEW CRITERIA AND SUGGESTED SCORES

Scoring Guidance for All Questions (Topics 1, 2, 3, and 4)

You have been asked to provide background information and advice to the CPIC Subcommittee on technical matters related to its scoring and evaluation of proposed IT investments for USAID. (See Table 3, CPIC Decision Criteria and Score Sheet.)

Your advice is sought on specific scoring criteria. The CPIC Subcommittee Chair must have identified for you those specific criteria on which your advice is sought.

The following score sheet lists the evaluation criteria for which your advice is sought. Please do the following:

A. General

- Critically review each investment and recommend subjective scores for the decision criteria which you have been asked to address, reflecting your experience and expertise.
- Recommend a score for the topic category or subcategory on which your advice has been sought, per instructions in the column labeled “Suggested Score.”
- You are not expected to provide advice on all criteria in this table unless requested by the CPIC Subcommittee Chair.
- Complete your assessment and submit it with your suggested scores and CPIC Summary Sheet 2 (“Technical Panel Summary Score Sheet”) to the CPIC Subcommittee Chair by the due date.
- Prepare a brief written and oral summary of your findings, with rationale and suggested scores for each investment.
- Present your assessment of each investment to the CPIC Subcommittee for its consideration in finalizing its scores. (The CPIC Subcommittee Chair will schedule the meeting for shortly after scores are due.)

ADS 577, Table 3a. CPIC TECHNICAL PANEL REVIEW CRITERIA AND SUGGESTED SCORES

B. Additional Scoring Guidance for Topics 1, 2, and 3 (Value, Risk, and Cost):

- The questions in Topics 1, 2, and 3 are grouped into categories and subcategories for scoring purposes.
- You are asked to recommend a score for the category or subcategory, considering your answers to all the questions in that group.
- A higher score implies a better investment than a lower score.
- No Suggested Score may exceed the Total Possible Score for the category or subcategory.

Background: The CPIC Subcommittee has written the questions so that (1) they can be answered by “Yes”, “No,” and “Not Applicable”; and (2) the answers have consistent meanings. A “Yes” means that the business case is consistent with best practices, Federal policy, or the Subcommittee’s assumptions about conditions for the success of IT investments. A “No” means that the business case isn’t consistent with such practices, policies, or assumptions. “Not Applicable” means that the question isn’t applicable to the business case. Therefore, in general, if the answers to questions in a subcategory or category tend to be positive, you would recommend more points than if the answers to the questions tend to be negative.

If the answers to a questions in a category or subcategory tend to be	You would
Yes	Recommend more points for the category or subcategory than if the answers tend to be “no.” However, you must not recommend more points than the Total Possible Score for that category or subcategory.
No	Recommend fewer points for the category or subcategory than if the answers tend to be “Yes.” However, you must not recommend a score that is less than zero.
Not Applicable	Not consider the “Not Applicable” criteria in recommending a score.

Note: The questions in Table 3a are noted in italics because they represent those questions from Table 3 that require specialized knowledge of USAID’s IT technical or regulatory environment. One question (2.7.2.3) has been printed in both italics and bold. It is one of several business-oriented questions being addressed by the Subcommittee in Risk Category 3. However, the Subcommittee would benefit from technical advice in addressing this question. The Technical Panel’s comments on question 2.7.2.3 will be provided to the CPIC Subcommittee for its reference in preparing scores for all of Risk Category 3.

* An asterisk indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised

ADS 577, Table 3a. CPIC TECHNICAL PANEL REVIEW CRITERIA AND SUGGESTED SCORES

Investment Title: _____

Technical Panel Member Name(s): _____

Review Date: _____

USAID Topics and Scoring Criteria

1. Topic: VALUE

Definition: Demonstration of tangible or measurable benefits resulting from the application of the requested investment.

Driver: Does the investment address a mission performance need?

Subcategory Number, Title, & Definition	Scoring Criteria Questions and Cross Reference to Exhibit 300 Business Case <small>[Cross references have been updated as of 5/24/05, and are based on draft OMB Circular No. A-11 (2005)]</small>	Comments	Subcategory – Total Possible Score	Suggested Score
<i>1.2 EA Relationships (Evidence that the investment has been identified as necessary by the Enterprise Architecture.)</i>	<i>1.2.1 Has this investment been identified as necessary in the Agency’s Enterprise Architecture? (See Exhibit 300, Section II.A.1.)</i>		<i>10 points for “EA Relationships” Subcategory</i>	<i>Suggest a single score for the subcategory</i>
	<i>1.2.2 Has the investment been cross-referenced to the Federal Enterprise Architecture model? (See Exhibit 300, Section II.A.1.)</i>			
	<i>1.2.3 Is the solution integrated with other systems supporting the workflow of the business function? (See Exhibit 300, Section I.B.9.)</i>			

* An asterisk indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised

ADS 577, Table 3a. CPIC TECHNICAL PANEL REVIEW CRITERIA AND SUGGESTED SCORES

Investment Title: _____

Technical Panel Member Name(s): _____ **Review Date:** _____

Subcategory Number, Title, & Definition	Scoring Criteria Questions and Cross Reference to Exhibit 300 Business Case <small>[Cross references have been updated as of 5/24/05, and are based on draft OMB Circular No. A-11 (2005)]</small>	Comments	Subcategory – Total Possible Score	Suggested Score
<i>1.3 Return on Investment (ROI) (The relationship between the funds invested in an initiative and the financial benefits the initiative will generate. A financial management approach used to explain how well a project delivers benefits in relationship to its cost.)</i>	<i>1.3.1 Has ROI been calculated for this investment, such as net present value (NPV)? Is it positive? (See Exhibit 300, Section I.E.3A.)</i>		<i>10 points for “Return on Investment” Subcategory</i>	<i>Suggest a single score for the subcategory</i>
	<i>1.3.2 Has any other benefit analysis, such as a cost benefit analysis (CBA) or payback period analysis, been conducted for this investment? If yes, does the analysis show that net savings exceed expected costs? (See Exhibit 300, Section I.E.3B.)</i>			
	<i>1.3.3 Does the projected ROI reflect such risk factors as the project’s technical complexity, the Agency’s management capacity, the likelihood of cost overruns, and the consequences of under- or non-performance? (See Exhibit 300, Section I.E.)</i>			
	<i>1.3.4 Does the ROI reflect actual returns observed through pilot projects and prototypes? (See Exhibit 300, Section I.E.)</i>			

* An asterisk indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised

ADS 577, Table 3a. CPIC TECHNICAL PANEL REVIEW CRITERIA AND SUGGESTED SCORES

	<i>1.3.5 Has the sponsor identified specific measurable and sustainable efficiencies to be gained in the business process resulting from this investment? (See Exhibit 300, Section I.E.2.)</i>			
--	---	--	--	--

* An asterisk indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised

ADS 577, Table 3a. CPIC TECHNICAL PANEL REVIEW CRITERIA AND SUGGESTED SCORES

Investment Title: _____

Technical Panel Member Name(s): _____ **Review Date:** _____

2. Topic: RISK

Definition: Factors that could occur during an investment’s life cycle, could jeopardize the success of the investment, and could be addressed through alternative courses of action. This topic includes the risks to successful implementation of the investment and the risks to successful Agency operations.

Driver: Will the project be implemented within cost and schedule goals and accomplish its performance objectives?

Subcategory Number , Title, & Definition	Scoring Criteria Questions and Cross Reference to Exhibit 300 Business Case <small>[Cross references have been updated as of 5/24/05, and are based on draft OMB Circular No. A-11 (2005)]</small>	Comments	Subcategory – Total Possible Score	Suggested Score
RISK CATEGORY 1	Cross Reference for all Risk Questions: Exhibit 300, Part I, Section I.F and other sections where noted.		<i>8 points for all of Risk Category 1</i>	<i>Suggest a single score for Risk Category 1</i>
<i>2.1 Technology (Risk associated with immaturity of commercially available technology; uniqueness of the technical solution; and technical problems associated with large projects.)</i>	<i>2.1.1 Does the project include the use of technology that is well-known and that has been used before in USAID? (See Exhibit 300, Part I, Section I.F.)</i>			
	<i>2.1.2 Does the project include the use of commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) solutions? If not, does it minimize the use of custom-designed components to reduce the technical risk? (See Exhibit 300, Part I, Section I.F.)</i>			
	<i>2.1.3 Would the investment be implemented in phased, successive chunks that are narrow in scope and brief in duration? (See Exhibit 300, Part I, Section I.F.)</i>			

* An asterisk indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised

ADS 577, Table 3a. CPIC TECHNICAL PANEL REVIEW CRITERIA AND SUGGESTED SCORES

Subcategory Number , Title, & Definition	Scoring Criteria Questions and Cross Reference to Exhibit 300 Business Case [Cross references have been updated as of 5/24/05, and are based on draft OMB Circular No. A-11 (2005)]	Comments	Subcategory – Total Possible Score	Suggested Score
2.2 <i>Definitional Risk (Risk of project failure due to ambiguous requirements)</i>	2.2.1 <i>Are the project requirements documented and clearly written? (See Exhibit 300, Part I, Section I.F.)</i>			
	2.2.2 <i>Are the project requirements highly predictable and defined with certainty?(See Exhibit 300, Part I, Section I.F.)</i>			
2.3 <i>Dependencies and interoperability between this investment and others</i>	2.3.1 <i>Does the successful implementation of this project appear to be independent of other project schedule, funding, or technical constraints? (See Exhibit 300, Part I, Section I.F.)</i>			

* An asterisk indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised

ADS 577, Table 3a. CPIC TECHNICAL PANEL REVIEW CRITERIA AND SUGGESTED SCORES

Investment Title: _____

Technical Panel Member Name(s): _____ **Review Date:** _____

2. Topic: RISK

Definition: Factors which could occur during an investment’s life cycle, could jeopardize the success of the investment, and could be addressed through alternative courses of action. This topic includes both the risks to successful implementation of the initiative and the risks to USAID of implementing the initiative.

Driver: Will the project be implemented within cost and schedule goals and accomplish its performance objectives?

Subcategory Number & Title	Scoring Criteria Questions and Cross Reference to Exhibit 300 Business Case <small>[Cross references have been updated as of 5/24/05, and are based on draft OMB Circular No. A-11 (2005)]</small>	Comments	Subcategory – Total Possible Score	Suggested Score
RISK CATEGORY 3 2.7 Resource Risk	2.7.2.3 Does USAID have appropriately trained and experienced project/program management staff available to successfully manage the project? (“Appropriately trained staff” could include those who have Project Management Professional (PMP) certification. “Appropriately experienced staff” could include those who have demonstrated successful experience in requirements development, program and project management, contract management, change management, communications, risk management, and interpersonal skills, IT specifications development, and testing for a project whose value was greater than \$5 million.)		N/A	<i>N/A – to be scored by Subcommittee members with other questions for this risk category.</i>

* An asterisk indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised

ADS 577, Table 3a. CPIC TECHNICAL PANEL REVIEW CRITERIA AND SUGGESTED SCORES

Investment Title: _____

Technical Panel Member Name(s): _____ **Review Date:** _____

3. Topic: COST

Definition: Assessment of the extent to which key cost factors have been considered in the cost estimate.

Subcategory Number & Title	Scoring Criteria Questions and Cross Reference to Exhibit 300 Business Case [Cross references have been updated as of 5/24/05, and are based on draft OMB Circular No. A-11 (2005)]	Comments	Subcategory – Total Possible Score	Suggested Score
3.1 <i>Life-Cycle Cost</i>	3.1.1 <i>Does the proposal include cost estimates for:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Hardware, software, and telecommunications needed to develop and implement the system?</i> - <i>In-house and contractor personnel required to develop, implement, and maintain the system?</i> - <i>Change management costs?</i> (See Exhibit 300, Part I. Summary of Spending for Project Stages; Section I.G.8, Acquisition Strategy; and Section I.H.2, Original Baseline, Cost & Schedule Goals.)		25 points for the subcategory	Suggest a single score for the subcategory
	3.1.2 <i>Does the cost estimate include all years of the projected life cycle?</i> (See Exhibit 300, Section I.A, Project Description, and sections noted above.)			

* An asterisk indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised

ADS 577, Table 3a. CPIC TECHNICAL PANEL REVIEW CRITERIA AND SUGGESTED SCORES

Subcategory Number, Title & Definition	Scoring Criteria Questions and Cross Reference to Exhibit 300 Business Case [Cross references have been updated as of 5/24/05, and are based on draft OMB Circular No. A-11 (2005)]	Comments	Subcategory – Possible Ratings	Suggested Rating
	<p><i>answer is “No” or “Don’t Know”, the investment should not be sent forward for funding. (Answers: Yes / No / Don’t Know)</i></p> <p><i>(c) Has the CISSO verified that the investment has an up-to-date security plan (separate from USAID’s General Support System security plan) that meets OMB policy and NIST guidelines, or has the CISSO verified that the security plan is included or required as part of the investment lifecycle? If the answer is “No” or “Don’t Know”, the investment should not be sent forward for funding. (See Exhibit 300, Part II, Section II.B.2.A, Security and Privacy (SE)) (Answers: Yes / No / Don’t Know)</i></p> <p><i>(d) Has the CISSO verified that the investment completed Certification and Accreditation (separate from USAID’s General Support System Certification and Accreditation) that meets NIST SP 800-37 and SP 800-53 guidelines, or has the CISSO verified that Certification and Accreditation is included or required as part of the investment lifecycle? If the answer is “No” or “Don’t Know”, the investment should not be sent forward</i></p>		<p>4.1.1 c – Y/N or N/A</p> <p>4.1.1 d – Y/N or N/A</p>	

* An asterisk indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised

ADS 577, Table 3a. CPIC TECHNICAL PANEL REVIEW CRITERIA AND SUGGESTED SCORES

Subcategory Number, Title & Definition	Scoring Criteria Questions and Cross Reference to Exhibit 300 Business Case [Cross references have been updated as of 5/24/05, and are based on draft OMB Circular No. A-11 (2005)]	Comments	Subcategory – Possible Ratings	Suggested Rating
	<i>for funding. (See Exhibit 300, Part II, Section II.B.2.B, Security and Privacy (SE)) (Answers: Yes / No / Don't Know)</i>			

* An asterisk indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised

ADS 577, Table 3a. CPIC TECHNICAL PANEL REVIEW CRITERIA AND SUGGESTED SCORES

Investment Title: _____

Technical Panel Member Name(s): _____

Review Date: _____

4. Topic: POLICY COMPLIANCE

Definition: Mandatory policy requirements for USAID IT investments.

Note: In this section, the proposal is scored by indicators of applicability and compliance. Therefore, possible scores are Yes, No, and where appropriate, Not Applicable or Don't Know.

Subcategory Number, Title & Definition	Scoring Criteria Questions and Cross Reference to Exhibit 300 Business Case <small>[Cross references have been updated as of 5/24/05, and are based on draft OMB Circular No. A-11 (2005)]</small>	Comments	Subcategory – Possible Ratings	Suggested Rating
4.2 <i>Security and Privacy</i> (Indication of whether or not the appropriate officials have determined that the investment meets computer security and privacy protection requirements.)	4.1.2 <i>Has the investment completed a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA), if required?</i> (See Exhibit 300, Part II, Section II.B.5.)		Y/N, N/A, or Don't Know	<i>Suggest a rating - Yes, No, Not Applicable (N/A), or Don't Know</i>

* An asterisk indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised

ADS 577, Table 3a. CPIC TECHNICAL PANEL REVIEW CRITERIA AND SUGGESTED SCORES

Investment Title: _____

Technical Panel Member Name(s): _____

Review Date: _____

4. Topic: POLICY COMPLIANCE

Definition: Mandatory policy requirements for USAID IT investments.

Note: In this section, the proposal is scored by indicators of applicability and compliance. Therefore, possible scores are Yes, No, and where appropriate, Not Applicable or Don't Know.

Subcategory Number, Title & Definition	Scoring Criteria Questions and Cross Reference to Exhibit 300 Business Case <small>[Cross references have been updated as of 5/24/05, and are based on draft OMB Circular No. A-11 (2005)]</small>	Comments	Subcategory – Possible Ratings	Suggested Rating
4.2 <i>Alternatives</i> (Assessment of the potential investment against alternative methods to achieve the same functional need.)	4.2.1 <i>Have viable E-Gov solutions been considered as alternatives to this proposal? Does this investment provide for functionality that is unavailable through the E-Gov solutions?</i> (See Exhibit 300, Part I, Section I.B.4.)		Y/N or Don't Know	<i>Suggest a rating - Yes, No, or Don't Know</i>
4.4 <i>“Ease of Use” and Section 508 Compliance</i> (Is the investment accessible to Federal employees and, where appropriate, members of the public?)	4.4.1 <i>Has the technology solution recommended for investment been assessed for Section 508 accessibility considerations for people with disabilities?</i> (See Exhibit 300, Part I, Section I.G.7, Acquisition Strategy.)		Y/N or Don't Know	<i>Suggest a Rating - Yes, No, or Don't Know</i>

577mah_071405_w080305_cd40

* An asterisk indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised