
Aforsoft

Product & Solution
Assessment

Rapid Assessment
Interior Architecture Firm
Proposal Process Assessment



Sample Quick Assessment Outputs

Sample Quick Assessment Outputs	1
1. Scenario Summary	2
1.1 Company Profile.....	2
1.2 Problem Addressed.....	2
1.3 Assessment Scope.....	2
2. Written Assessment Summary	3
2.1 Problem Definition.....	3
2.2 Current Process Summary.....	3
2.3 Scope and Boundaries.....	4
2.4 Proposed Approach (High Level).....	5
3. Actionable Steps	5
3.1 Continue / Stop Decision.....	5
3.2 Recommended Next Steps.....	6
3.3 Risks and Points of Attention.....	6
4. Assessment Outcome	7
4.1 Clarified Points.....	7
4.2 Intentionally Left Open.....	7



1. Scenario Summary

1.1 Company Profile

The assessed company is an interior architecture office with a team of 5–10 people, primarily carrying out residential and commercial projects.

The company manages multiple projects simultaneously and runs design, proposal, revision, and implementation processes in parallel.

Operational work is largely carried out through email, WhatsApp, and file-sharing tools.

There is no technical team, and process tracking is mainly handled by project managers.

1.2 Problem Addressed

The company is experiencing the following issues, particularly in the proposal and approval process:

- It is not clearly visible which stage proposals are at
- Revision requests may be lost because they come through different channels
- Tasks waiting for approval are delayed, and the reasons for delays are not clear
- Project managers spend a disproportionate amount of time on operational follow-up

This situation negatively affects both customer satisfaction and internal team efficiency.

The company wants to quickly and clearly understand whether this process can be improved through software or automation.

1.3 Assessment Scope

Within this assessment, only the following processes have been addressed:

- Proposal creation



- Sending the proposal to the client
- Receiving revision requests
- Proposal approval / rejection

The following topics have been consciously excluded from scope:

- Design production processes
- Construction site and implementation tracking
- Accounting and invoicing
- Supplier and material management

The goal is to produce a quick decision by focusing on a single critical process.

2. Written Assessment Summary

2.1 Problem Definition

As a result of the assessment, the problem has been clarified as not the production of proposals, but the lack of visibility and manageability of the proposal process.

In the current situation, the issue is not preparing proposals, but the inability to reliably track, in a single place:

- which stage proposals are at
- who they are waiting for revisions from
- how long they have been waiting

This leads to delays and an increase in operational load due to repeated manual checks.

2.2 Current Process Summary

The current process reviewed within the scope of the assessment operates as follows:



- The project manager prepares the proposal content
- The proposal is sent to the client as a PDF via email
- Revision requests are communicated via email or WhatsApp
- Revisions are tracked manually
- Approval or feedback is awaited

Throughout the process:

- Proposal statuses are not maintained in a central location
- The number and content of revisions are not systematically recorded
- Waiting times cannot be measured

As the process progresses, control is lost and tracking becomes entirely dependent on individual effort.

2.3 Scope and Boundaries

This assessment is limited solely to the operational tracking of the proposal and approval process.

The following topics are outside the scope of this study:

- How proposal content is prepared
- Design production tools
- Financial calculations or pricing models
- Post-project implementation processes

The goal is to determine whether intervention through software or automation is necessary by addressing the problem at its smallest meaningful unit.



2.4 Proposed Approach (High Level)

The proposed approach for this problem is to create a lightweight software layer that makes the proposal process visible and traceable, without completely changing existing working habits.

Within the proposed approach:

- Proposals are tracked in a single central location
- Status information is maintained for each proposal
- Revision requests are recorded
- Approval waiting times become measurable

This approach:

- Does not completely eliminate existing email and file usage
- Is suitable for gradual adoption
- Can be tested with a small initial step

Detailed technical design is not included within the scope of this assessment.

3. Actionable Steps

3.1 Continue / Stop Decision

As a result of the assessment, proceeding with a software-supported improvement for the proposal and approval process is considered meaningful. However, instead of handling this as a large-scope project, it is recommended to test it with a small and controlled first step.

The decision is as follows:

- Continue: Yes
- Approach: Small-scale, focused initial implementation
- Scope: Proposal and revision tracking only



This decision aims to observe whether the process genuinely improves, with low risk.

3.2 Recommended Next Steps

The recommended steps for the next phase are as follows:

As a first step, a simple structure should be designed in which proposals can be created and tracked from a single center.

Within this structure:

- Basic information for each proposal is recorded
- The current status of the proposal (preparing, sent, revision requested, approved) is tracked
- Revision requests are linked to the proposal
- Waiting times become measurable

At this stage, the goal is not to redesign the entire process end to end, but to make the existing process visible.

The implementation period should be kept short, tested on real projects, and feedback should be collected.

3.3 Risks and Points of Attention

The main points to consider in this process are:

- Uncontrolled expansion of scope
- Adding too many features in the initial phase
- Expecting existing working habits to be completely abandoned

Especially in the first step, the "since we've already started, let's add this as well" mindset poses a risk. Therefore, the initial implementation should be handled with clear boundaries, and continuation or pivot decisions should be made based on the results obtained.



4. Assessment Outcome

4.1 Clarified Points

As a result of this assessment, the following points have been clarified:

- The core problem is not proposal production, but the lack of visibility and traceability of the proposal and revision process
- The current process survives through individual effort due to the absence of a central tracking mechanism
- Addressing the process with a software-supported improvement can provide meaningful and measurable benefits
- This improvement can be tested with a small and controlled first step, without a large-scale project

This clarity removes uncertainty around which problem to intervene in and which direction to proceed.

4.2 Intentionally Left Open

The following topics were consciously not addressed within the scope of this assessment:

- Detailed user management or role structures
- Dashboard, screen, or interface designs
- Advanced reporting and analysis needs
- Operational areas outside the proposal process

These topics were excluded to focus on validating the core problem in the initial phase and determining whether the improvement truly creates value.

They may be addressed in a separate and more comprehensive effort only if the first step proves successful.