

Graded parameters. A clearer decision.

An on-page example of the evaluation framework, with grades, weights, and the assumptions behind them.

ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE • HYPOTHETICAL ASSUMPTIONS

Fictional signal-level HIL configuration. These values demonstrate the scoring method and are not the results of a supplier or customer evaluation.

3.65 / 5 Illustrative weighted score

Parameters and sample grades

Parameter	Weight	Sample grade	Example assumption
Technical fit	30%	4/5 Good fit	Assume required I/O and timing fit the defined workload, with some expansion headroom.
Integration	20%	3/5 Baseline fit	Assume the required interfaces are available, with some adaptation still needed.
Automation	20%	4/5 Good fit	Assume repeatable execution, scripting, and reporting cover the proposed workflow.
Ownership cost	15%	3/5 Baseline fit	Assume the quote fits the budget, while recurring cost and maintenance effort need clarification.
Support & lifecycle	15%	4/5 Good fit	Assume proposed documentation, support, and expansion options cover the expected needs.

How the score is calculated

Each sample grade is multiplied by its agreed weight. The weighted values are added to produce an overall score out of five. The example weights total 100%.

$$(4 \times 30 + 3 \times 20 + 4 \times 20 + 3 \times 15 + 4 \times 15) / 100 = 3.65 / 5$$

Keep mandatory requirements visible

Mandatory requirements: Not verified in this sample.

A weighted score does not override a failed mandatory requirement. A real recommendation needs agreed acceptance criteria, configuration details, evidence sources, and a review of outstanding questions.

Illustration only. No supplier rating, customer result, or purchase endorsement.

Simitro · Automotive HIL & software evaluation

simitro.com · simitroworks@gmail.com