AI Vendor Evaluation Form

Purpose of this document: *This form helps organizations compare AI vendors objectively across key criteria to support informed, compliant, and transparent selection decisions.*

Vendor Name	
AI Solution Description	
Regulatory Compliance	
Data Privacy & Security Measures	
Clinical Validation Evidence	
Integration Capabilities	
Support & Maintenance	
Direct and Indirect Costs	

Selection Panel Participant Criteria

☐ Clinical workflow leader

☐ IT personnel leader

☐ Revenue cycle/finance leader

☐ Quality leader

☐ Compliance leader

☐ Business system/reporting leader

Scoring Criteria

1 **Unacceptable**: Does not meet expectations

2 **Poor**: Significant gaps or concerns

3 **Fair**: Partially meets expectations; moderate concerns

4 **Good**: Meets expectations with minor gaps

5 **Excellent**: Fully meets or exceeds expectations with strong evidence

Detailed Criteria Definitions

Model Performance: The effectiveness of the AI/BI model in delivering accurate, reliable, and clinically relevant outcomes. This includes metrics such as accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, precision, recall, and robustness across diverse patient populations. It also considers the model's ability to generalize, its validation against real-world data, and its alignment with clinical workflows.

Regulatory Compliance: Adherence to healthcare regulations such as HIPAA, FDA, and other relevant standards.

Data Privacy & Security Measures: Mechanisms to protect patient data, including encryption, access controls, and compliance with privacy laws.

Clinical Validation Evidence/Workflow Support: Availability of peer-reviewed studies, clinical trials, or real-world evidence supporting the AI solution.

Integration/ Interoperability Capabilities: Ability to integrate with existing healthcare systems such as EHRs, PACS, and other IT infrastructure. Extent to which the solution supports interoperability standards and facilitates data exchange.

Support & Maintenance: Quality and availability of vendor support, training, and ongoing maintenance services.

Direct and Indirect Costs: Total cost of ownership, including licensing, implementation, training, and operational costs.

Market Presence: Vendor's reputation, customer base, and longevity in the healthcare AI market.

Infrastructure/Hosting: Deployment options (cloud/on-premise), scalability, and reliability of hosting infrastructure.

Development Opportunities: The product's capacity to evolve through adaptation to new data inputs, enabling continuous improvement in performance and relevance. This also includes the vendor's willingness and capability to collaborate with the healthcare organization for future customization, co-development, and alignment with emerging clinical and operational needs.

Vendor Evaluation Form Template

Criteria	Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Max Score	Weight	Notes
Model Performance					High	
Regulatory Compliance					Medium	
Data Privacy & Security Measures					High	
Clinical Validation Evidence/workflow support					High	
Integration/ Interoperability Capabilities					Medium	
Support & Maintenance					Low	
Direct and Indirect Costs					High	
Market Presence					Medium	
Infrastructure/ Hosting					Low	
Development Opportunities					Medium	

Vendor Evaluation Example

The below provides a comparative evaluation with scoring for three AI vendors based on key criteria relevant to healthcare AI implementation.

Criteria	Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Max Score	Weight	Notes
Model Performance	8	9	7	10	High	
Regulatory Compliance	9	8	8	10	Medium	
Data Privacy & Security Measures	6	6	9	10	High	
Clinical Validation Evidence/workflow support	8	6	8	10	High	
Integration/ Interoperability Capabilities	7	8	6	10	Medium	

Support & Maintenance	8	7	9	10	Low	
Direct and Indirect Costs	9	8	7	10	High	
Market Presence	8	9	6	10	Medium	
Infrastructure/ Hosting	5	7	7	10	Low	
Development Opportunities	5	7	9	10	Medium	

Summary Analysis & Reason for Selection

Vendor A demonstrates strong compliance and ethical standards, with good support and user experience. However, integration capabilities are slightly lower.

Vendor B excels in model performance and user experience, making it a strong candidate for clinical applications. Compliance and ethics are satisfactory.

Vendor C offers strong support but lags in model performance and user experience. It may be suitable for administrative use cases with less clinical impact.

R122325