01 / THE INPUTS

A proposal section you can check.

30-day application-support transition | Technical approach demonstration

DEMONSTRATION ONLY The solicitation, contractor records, personnel and results below are fictional. They are not Brevidy performance claims or client work. This AI-assisted example has not been independently reviewed by a proposal specialist.

This example connects a requirement, source material, a draft and a review record. It distinguishes supplied facts from proposed methods and unresolved commitments.

Fictional solicitation excerpt

ID	What the bidder must address
R1	Describe a 30-calendar-day transition for two internal applications without interrupting scheduled support.
R2	Identify an accountable lead, transition phases, deliverables and customer sign-off before taking over support.
R3	Provide one comparable past project and a measurable result.
R4	Explain how weekday coverage, 08:00–18:00 agency local time, and escalation readiness will be maintained.

Fictional source packet

These excerpts stand in for customer-approved records. Line labels allow each factual statement in the draft to be checked against an exact passage.

Record	Exact illustrative source text
S1 Prior-project closeout	L1: The contractor transitioned support for three internal reporting applications. L2: Handover was accepted on calendar day 28. The incident register recorded zero transition-attributed critical incidents during the 30-day transition period.
S2 Team qualifications	L1: The proposed transition lead managed the project recorded in S1. L2: Two proposed support engineers each have at least four years of application-support experience.
S3 Operating procedure	L1: All support requests are logged in the ticketing system. L2: Production changes require written customer approval and a documented rollback procedure.
S4 Current scope note	L1: The proposed engagement covers two internal applications. L2: Required coverage is weekdays, 08:00–18:00, agency local time.

Not supplied: confirmed staff availability, an approved coverage roster, access arrangements, outgoing-team participation, or agreed acceptance criteria.

02 / THE DRAFT

Technical approach

Annotated working draft for customer review

HOW TO READ THIS PAGE S# references identify fictional source evidence; R# references identify requirements. B–F contain a proposed method, not demonstrated past performance. U# marks an unresolved issue listed on page 3. All new commitments require customer approval.

A. Relevant experience

Our proposed transition lead managed the handover of three internal reporting applications. Acceptance occurred on calendar day 28, and the incident register recorded zero transition-attributed critical incidents during the 30-day transition period. [S1:L1–L2; S2:L1] We propose a phased, 30-day handover for the two applications in the current scope. [R1; S4:L1]

B. Days 1–5: establish the baseline

The transition lead would confirm the application inventory, dependencies, scheduled jobs, open incidents and escalation contacts with the customer and outgoing team. The team would validate permissions before handling live support and record access gaps, owners and required dates. Deliverables: an agreed inventory, initial issue register and handover plan. Access and outgoing-team participation remain unconfirmed. [U2]

C. Days 6–15: shadow and document

The proposed engineers would shadow routine support, rehearse incident triage in a customer-approved setting and assemble the operating runbook. Support requests would be logged in the ticketing system; production changes would require written customer approval and a documented rollback procedure. [S3:L1–L2] Deliverables: a draft runbook, escalation list and rehearsal record.

D. Days 16–25: demonstrate readiness

The incoming team would perform agreed support activities under outgoing-team observation. The lead would track unresolved issues and review rehearsal results with the customer. The proposed handover keeps the existing support arrangement in place until written acceptance; that arrangement must first be agreed. [U2] Deliverables: an observed-work checklist and updated risk register.

E. Days 26–30: review and accept

The transition lead would present the runbook, access checks, rehearsal results, open risks and coverage roster for customer acceptance. Ownership would transfer only after written sign-off. An unmet readiness condition would trigger a customer decision on remediation and schedule, not an unsupported assurance of completion. Acceptance criteria remain to be agreed. [U3]

F. Coverage and escalation

The required service window is weekdays, 08:00–18:00, agency local time. [S4:L2] The proposed lead would coordinate two support engineers, each with at least four years of application-support experience. [S2:L2] Before takeover, a named primary/backup roster and escalation contacts would be approved. Staff availability and coverage have not been established by the supplied records. [U1]

SUBMISSION HOLD Resolve U1–U3 and approve the proposed commitments before removing review annotations. The draft does not establish a zero-downtime guarantee.

03 / THE REVIEW RECORD

Evidence, coverage and open issues

A readable draft is not the same as a submission-ready response.

Requirement coverage

Requirement	Draft location	Review status
R1 · 30-day continuity	B–F	Approach drafted; U1–U3 still prevent a complete commitment.
R2 · Lead and acceptance	B–E	Accountability and outputs drafted; acceptance criteria open (U3).
R3 · Comparable result	A	Supported by S1 and S2 within this fictional example only.
R4 · Hours and escalation	F	Required hours cited; staff availability and coverage unconfirmed (U1).

Claim-to-source map

Draft statement	Exact support	Boundary of the evidence
30 days; two applications	R1; S4:L1	Requirement and scope, not proof that delivery is feasible.
3 applications; day 28; zero transition-attributed critical incidents	S1:L1–L2	One prior project. Not a zero-downtime or future-performance guarantee.
Lead managed that project	S2:L1	Prior role only; availability for this engagement is not confirmed.
Two engineers; at least four years each	S2:L2	Experience only; not confirmed staffing or shift coverage.
Tickets logged; changes approved with rollback	S3:L1–L2	Documented procedure, not proof of execution on this engagement.
Weekday 08:00–18:00 coverage	S4:L2	Required service window, not verified delivery capacity.

Open issues that must not be filled with invention

U1 · Staffing / proposal owner — Obtain named commitments, availability and a primary/backup roster covering the full required window.

U2 · Access and handover / technical lead — Confirm permissions, outgoing-team participation and the interim support arrangement before relying on the schedule.

U3 · Acceptance / proposal owner + customer — Agree the service baseline, readiness evidence, sign-off authority and action if readiness is not achieved.

A CLAIM WE DID NOT MAKE "We guarantee zero downtime." The closeout record reports zero transition-attributed critical incidents on one past project. It does not establish zero downtime, current staffing or future results.

Review status: AI-assisted drafting and internal consistency checks only. No independent proposal-specialist review has been performed. This sample demonstrates the proposed format, not a validated delivery system or a completed paid engagement.