ILLUSTRATIVE ENGINEERING DOCUMENT

Supplier Evaluation Matrix

Illustrative weighted technical comparison for three fictional vendors. Scores are examples only; they do not represent market research, real suppliers or purchasing advice.

01 Evaluation principle

Agree mandatory requirements first. Any non-conformance should be documented and resolved before weighted scores are considered.

02 Example scoring matrix (1–5 scale)

Criteria (weight)	Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C
Process fit (30%)	4	5	3
Integration (20%)	3	4	5
Service support (20%)	5	3	4
Lifecycle cost (20%)	3	4	5
Delivery risk (10%)	4	3	3
Weighted result	3.8	4.0	4.0

03 Screening checklist

Gate	Status
Required certificates/documentation	Check evidence
Environmental compatibility	Confirm by tests
Integration interfaces	Confirm detailed scope
FAT/SAT criteria	Agree before order
Supplier references	Use only with permission

04 Interpretation

The numerical ranking is **not** a selection decision. Equal scores can conceal different technical and commercial exposures. Compare exclusions, acceptance risks and suitability in the actual process.

05 Clarifications required

Question	Expected response
Is the quoted configuration complete?	Formal bill of supply and exclusions
What is the integration scope?	Interface matrix and ownership
How is performance verified?	Agreed test data and acceptance method
How is long-term support delivered?	SLA, response time and spare-parts availability

06 Decision memo template

Preferred option: to be determined after technical clarification. **Rationale:** process fit, acceptable risks and lifecycle costs. **Conditions precedent:** completed technical data, signed performance commitments and agreed implementation responsibilities.

Independence and disclosure

The advisor’s role and any relevant supplier commissions, relationships or conflicts of interest must be disclosed under the agreed engagement terms. This fictional matrix demonstrates a method, not a neutral review of actual vendors.