Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	Accent on L	anguages,	Inc.					Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	2	4	2	4	2	4			4	4
Project Approach	30%	2	12	3	18	2	12			14	14
Written Translation Samples	30%	4	24	4	24	4	24			24	24
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	2	4	3	6	2	4			5	5
Staffing and Organization	10%	3	6	3	6	3	6			6	6
References	5%	2	2	3	3	3	3			3	3
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	2	2	3	3	3	3			3	3
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%	17.0	54.0	21.0	64.0	19.0	56.0			58	58

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	Andinas DB	A inlingua l	Jtah					Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	3	6	2	4	3	6			5	5
Project Approach	30%	2	12	3	18	3	18			16	16
Written Translation Samples	30%	3	18	3	18	3	18			18	18
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	4	8	4	8	3	6			7	7
Staffing and Organization	10%	4	8	3	6	4	8			7	7
References	5%	4	4	3	3	3	3			3	3
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	3	3	2	2	3	3			3	3
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%	23.0	59.0	20.0	59.0	22.0	62.0			60	60

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	Avantpage,	Inc.						Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	5	10	4	8	5	10			9	9
Project Approach	30%	4	24	3	18	4	24			22	22
Written Translation Samples	30%	3	18	3	18	3	18			18	18
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	2	4	3	6	2	4			5	5
Staffing and Organization	10%	5	10	4	8	4	8			9	9
References	5%	5	5	4	4	4	4			4	4
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	5	5	4	4	5	5			5	5
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%	29.0	76.0	25.0	66.0	27.0	73.0			72	72

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	Cal Interpret	ting & Trans	slations, In	C.				Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	4	8	3	6	3	6			7	7
Project Approach	30%	3	18	2	12	3	18			16	16
Written Translation Samples	30%	4	24	4	24	4	24			24	24
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	5	10	5	10	4	8			9	9
Staffing and Organization	10%	5	10	4	8	4	8			9	9
References	5%	3	3	3	3	2	2			3	3
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	4	4	4	4	5	5			4	4
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%	28.0	77.0	25.0	67.0	25.0	71.0			72	72

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	Corporate T	ranslation S	Services, In	c. DBA Lan	guage Linl	(Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	5	10	5	10	5	10			10	10
Project Approach	30%	3	18	4	24	4	24			22	22
Written Translation Samples	30%	4	24	4	24	4	24			24	24
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	4	8	4	8	5	10			9	9
Staffing and Organization	10%	5	10	5	10	5	10			10	10
References	5%	5	5	5	5	5	5			5	5
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	4	4	5	5	5	5			5	5
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%	30.0	79.0	32.0	86.0	33.0	88.0			84	84

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	CyraCom In	ternational,	Inc.					Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	4	8	3	6	3	6			7	7
Project Approach	30%	3	18	3	18	4	24			20	20
Written Translation Samples	30%	3	18	3	18	3	18			18	18
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	4	8	3	6	4	8			7	7
Staffing and Organization	10%	4	8	3	6	3	6			7	7
References	5%	4	4	4	4	3	3			4	4
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	4	4	4	4	4	4			4	4
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%	26.0	68.0	23.0	62.0	24.0	69.0			66	66

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	Daniel Sham	nebo Sabor	e DBA Lanç	guages Trar	slation Se	rvices		Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	4	8	3	6	3	6			7	7
Project Approach	30%	3	18	3	18	3	18			18	18
Written Translation Samples	30%	3	18	3	18	3	18			18	18
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	3	6	3	6	3	6			6	6
Staffing and Organization	10%	3	6	3	6	2	4			5	5
References	5%	4	4	3	3	3	3			3	3
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	3	3	3	3	3	3			3	3
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%	23.0	63.0	21.0	60.0	20.0	58.0			60	60

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	Geneva Wor	Idwide, Inc						Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	3	6	3	6	3	6			6	6
Project Approach	30%	3	18	3	18	4	24			20	20
Written Translation Samples	30%	4	24	4	24	4	24			24	24
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	3	6	3	6	3	6			6	6
Staffing and Organization	10%	3	6	3	6	3	6			6	6
References	5%	4	4	3	3	3	3			3	3
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	3	3	3	3	3	3			3	3
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%	23.0	67.0	22.0	66.0	23.0	72.0			68	68

4/8/2019 PAGE 4 OF 118

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	Hanna Interp	oreting Serv	vices LLC					Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	5	10	4	8	5	10			9	9
Project Approach	30%	5	30	4	24	4	24			26	26
Written Translation Samples	30%	3	18	3	18	3	18			18	18
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	3	6	3	6	3	6			6	6
Staffing and Organization	10%	5	10	4	8	4	8			9	9
References	5%	5	5	4	4	4	4			4	4
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	5	5	4	4	5	5			5	5
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%	31.0	84.0	26.0	72.0	28.0	75.0			77	77

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	Interpreters	Unlimited,	Inc.					Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	3	6	3	6	3	6			6	6
Project Approach	30%	5	30	4	24	4	24			26	26
Written Translation Samples	30%	3	18	3	18	3	18			18	18
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	4	8	3	6	4	8			7	7
Staffing and Organization	10%	5	10	4	8	4	8			9	9
References	5%	4	4	3	3	3	3			3	3
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	5	5	4	4	5	5			5	5
Grand Total - Must Equal 10	0% 100%	29.0	81.0	24.0	69.0	26.0	72.0			74	74

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	LinguaLinx	Language S	Solutions, li	nc.				Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	5	10	4	8	4	8			9	9
Project Approach	30%	5	30	4	24	4	24			26	26
Written Translation Samples	30%	3	18	3	18	3	18			18	18
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	5	10	5	10	5	10			10	10
Staffing and Organization	10%	5	10	4	8	4	8			9	9
References	5%	4	4	3	3	3	3			3	3
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	5	5	4	4	5	5			5	5
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%	32.0	87.0	27.0	75.0	28.0	76.0			79	79

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	Linguava Int	terpreters, l	nc.					Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	3	6	3	6	2	4			5	5
Project Approach	30%	2	12	2	12	2	12			12	12
Written Translation Samples	30%	3	18	3	18	3	18			18	18
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	3	6	2	4	2	4			5	5
Staffing and Organization	10%	4	8	3	6	3	6			7	7
References	5%	3	3	3	3	3	3			3	3
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	2	2	3	3	3	3			3	3
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%	20.0	55.0	19.0	52.0	18.0	50.0			52	52

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	Propio LS L	LC						Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	3	6	2	4	2	4			5	5
Project Approach	30%	3	18	3	18	3	18			18	18
Written Translation Samples	30%	4	24	4	24	4	24			24	24
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	5	10	5	10	5	10			10	10
Staffing and Organization	10%	4	8	3	6	3	6			7	7
References	5%	4	4	4	4	4	4			4	4
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	4	4	3	3	3	3			3	3
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%	27.0	74.0	24.0	69.0	24.0	69.0			71	71

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	oposer: Terra Translations LLC								Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	1	2	2	4	2	4				3	3
Project Approach	30%	1	6	2	12	2	12				10	10
Written Translation Samples	30%	4	24	4	24	4	24				24	24
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	2	4	3	6	3	6				5	5
Staffing and Organization	10%	1	2	1	2	1	2				2	2
References	5%	1	1	1	1	1	1				1	1
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	3	3	3	3	3	3				3	3
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%	13.0	42.0	16.0	52.0	16.0	52.0				49	49

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	Translation	and Simulta	aneous Inte	rpreting				Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	3	6	3	6	3	6			6	6
Project Approach	30%	2	12	2	12	3	18			14	14
Written Translation Samples	30%	4	24	4	24	4	24			24	24
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	4	8	3	6	4	8			7	7
Staffing and Organization	10%	3	6	3	6	3	6			6	6
References	5%	3	3	3	3	2	2			3	3
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	3	3	3	3	4	4			3	3
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%	22.0	62.0	21.0	60.0	23.0	68.0			63	63

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	TransPerfec	t Translatio	ns Internat	tional Inc				Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	4	8	3	6	3	6			7	7
Project Approach	30%	5	30	4	24	4	24			26	26
Written Translation Samples	30%	4	24	4	24	4	24			24	24
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	2	4	2	4	3	6			5	5
Staffing and Organization	10%	5	10	4	8	4	8			9	9
References	5%	5	5	4	4	4	4			4	4
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	5	5	5	5	4	4			5	5
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%	30.0	86.0	26.0	75.0	26.0	76.0			79	79

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	oposer: United Language Group								Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	5	10	5	10	5	10				10	10
Project Approach	30%	5	30	4	24	5	30				28	28
Written Translation Samples	30%	4	24	4	24	4	24				24	24
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	3	6	4	8	4	8				7	7
Staffing and Organization	10%	5	10	5	10	5	10				10	10
References	5%	5	5	5	5	5	5				5	5
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	5	5	5	5	5	5				5	5
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%	32.0	90.0	32.0	86.0	33.0	92.0				89	89

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	roposer:							Score	Weighted	
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise Project Approach Written Translation Samples	10% 30% 30%											
Written Translation Samples Proposed Compensation to County Staffing and Organization	10% 10%											
References Proposal Organization/Completeness	5% 5%											
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%										0	0



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Accent on Languages, Inc.

Évaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	2	20
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	2	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.		er ⁱ t.	



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
Accuracy			
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	2	20
Proposal domonstrator			
Proposal demonstrates:			Ì
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate; STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION			
사용에 불어받아, 트레탈리아, 이 문문에는 이 작업되어, 소리한 대한 대학생이 시작되는데 이번 소리를 받아 나는 사람이 되었다. 나는 사람들은 사람들이 되었다.	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates:			
 Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the 			
Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess			
experience working with public agencies to provide similar			
services.			
Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	2	10
Proposal demonstrates:			
References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of			
the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to			
provide the requested services.		İ	
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE	5	2	10
AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT			
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
nstructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; 			
 RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; 			
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no			
exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		270
Total Weig			500
Converted to 1	00 point so	core total	54



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Accent on Languages, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	. 2	20
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
• Formatting			İ
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates:			
Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	1000		
Proposal demonstrates:	10	3	30
 Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. 			
Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP nstructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		320
Total Weig	hted Possibl	e Score	500
Converted to 1	00 point sco	ore total	64



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Accent on Languages, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	2	20
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	2	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy • Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity Consistency			
• Formatting		:	
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	2	20
Proposal demonstrates: Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no			
exceptions noted.		-	
Respondent Total	100		280
	hted Possii		500
Converted to 1	100 point so	core total	56



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Andinas DBA inlingua Utah

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	2	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the			
same score based on the SMEs evaluation)]
• Accuracy			
• Completeness	1		
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates:			
Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates:	10	4	40
Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide			
experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the	1	\$	
Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess			
experience working with public agencies to provide similar			
services.	1		
Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	4	20
Proposal demonstrates:			
References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of			
the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to			
provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE	5	3	15
AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL			
CONTRACT			
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
instructions:			į
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; 			
RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no			
exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		295
Total Weig	ghted Possibl	e Score	500
Converted to	100 point scc	re total	59



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Andinas DBA inlingua Utah

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	2	20
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	20	7 ^	T 00
<u> - 1984 의 사람이 있는 이 경험에 가장하는 것이 되면 하는 이 경험에 되었다면 하는 것이 되었다면 하는 것이 없다. 그런 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이 없다. 그런 것이 있다면 하는 것이 없는 것이 없다면 했다면 없다면 없다면 없다면 없다면 없다면 없다면 없다면 없다면 없다면 없</u>	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
Accuracy			
Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates:			ļ
Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	4.		
	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates:			
 Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the 			
Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess			
experience working with public agencies to provide similar			
services.			
Compliance with election code § 14111.			į
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates:			
References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of		,	
the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to			
provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE	5	2	10
AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL			. •
CONTRACT			
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; 			
RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no			
exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		295
Total Weig	hted Possil	ole Score	500
Converted to 1	00 point so	core total	59



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Andinas DBA inlingua Utah

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
CompletenessLocal/Cultural Sensitivity			1
Consistency			
• Formatting			,
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates:	·		
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:	i		
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		310
Total Weig			500
Converted to 1	00 point sc	core total	62



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Avantpage, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	. 4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION CAMPUTE	T	.,	
WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the			
same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
Accuracy			
Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
Consistency			<u> </u>
Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	2	20
Dan soul I			
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates:			
Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide			
experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the			
Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess			
experience working with public agencies to provide similar]	
services.			
Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	5	25
Proposal demonstrates:			
References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of			
the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to			
provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE	5	5	O.F.
AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL	3	5	25
CONTRACT			
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
instructions:			į
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; 			
RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no			
exceptions noted.	ł		
Respondent Total	100	·	380
Total Weig		ole Score	500
Converted to 1			76
	22 23111 30	-5.5 /0/GI	, 0



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Avantpage, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy • Completeness			
Local/Cultural SensitivityConsistencyFormatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	4	20
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	4	20
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		330
	hted Possil		500
Converted to 1	100 point sc	core total	66



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Avantpage, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
Accuracy			
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity		ľ	j
Consistency			Ĭ
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	2	20
Proposal demonstrates:			
Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1		40
Proposal demonstrates:	10	4	40
Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide			
experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the			
Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess			
experience working with public agencies to provide similar			
services.			
Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	4	20
Proposal demonstrates:			
References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of			
the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to			
provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	5	25
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; 			
RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no		'	
exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		365
Total Weig			500
Converted to 1	00 point sc	ore total	73



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Cal Interpreting & Translations, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
AccuracyCompleteness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	4	20
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP nstructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		385
Total Weig	ghted Possik	ole Score	500
Converted to 1	100 point sc	ore total	77



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Cal Interpreting & Translations, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	2	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates:			
Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates:		<u> </u>	40
 Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess 			
experience working with public agencies to provide similar			
services.			
 Compliance with election code § 14111.]	
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	. 4	20
Completeness of response in accordance with DED			
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; 			
RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no			
exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		335
	hted Possil		500
Converted to 1	00 point so	core total	67



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Cal Interpreting & Translations, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy • Completeness • Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
Consistency			
• Formatting			Í
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.	,		
REFERENCES	5	2	10
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	5	25
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		355
	hted Possib	ole Score	500
Converted to 1			71



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Corporate Translation Services, Inc. DBA Language Link

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	1 4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the			1
same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
Accuracy		1	1
• Completeness			ļ
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates:			
Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10		50
Proposal demonstrates:	10	. 5	50
 Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide 			
experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the			i
Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess			
experience working with public agencies to provide similar			
services.		[·	
Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	5	25
Proposal demonstrates:			
References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of			
the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to			
provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE	5	4	20
AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT			20
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
instructions:]		
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; 			
 RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; 			
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no			
exceptions noted.			İ
Respondent Total	100		395
Total Weig			500
Converted to 1	00 point sc	ore total	79



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Corporate Translation Services, Inc. DBA Language Link

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	- 5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	5	25
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		·	
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	5	25
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		430
	ghted Possik		500
Converted to	100 point sc	ore total	86



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Corporate Translation Services, Inc. DBA Language Link

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy • Completeness • Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
ConsistencyFormatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	5	25
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			<u> </u>
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	5	25
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		440
Total Weig	hted Possil	ble Score	500
Converted to 1	00 point so	core total	88



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: CyraCom International, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
Accuracy			
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
• Formatting	:		
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates:			i
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates:		1.	70
 Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide 			
experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the			
Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess			
experience working with public agencies to provide similar			ľ
services.			
Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	4	20
Proposal demonstrates:			
References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of			
the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to			
provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	4	20
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
nstructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; 	İ		
RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;		,	
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no			
exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		340
Total Weig	hted Possik	ole Score	500
Converted to 1	00 point sc	ore total	68



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: CyraCom International, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			,
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	. 3	30
Proposal demonstrates:			,
Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			i
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	3	20
Proposal demonstrates:	I A STUDIES	3	30
 Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide 			
experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the			
Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess			
experience working with public agencies to provide similar			
services.			i
Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	4	20
Proposal demonstrates:			
References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of			
the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to		· }	
provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	4	20
<u> </u>			
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; 			
 RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; 			
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no			
exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		310
	ghted Possi		500
Converted to	100 point sc	core total	62



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: CyraCom International, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	. 3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
• Accuracy			
Completeness Lead/Cultural Sensitivity			
Local/Cultural SensitivityConsistency			
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	4	20
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		345
	ghted Possi		500
Converted to	100 point so	core total	69



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Daniel Shamebo Sabore DBA Languages Translation Services

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy • Completeness • Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
ConsistencyFormatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	4	20
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		315
Total Weig			500
Converted to 1	00 point sc	core total	63



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Daniel Shamebo Sabore DBA Languages Translation Services

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the			
same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
• Accuracy			
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural SensitivityConsistency			ļ
Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates:			
Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates:	. und 10. * * 4 * 11 * 1		
Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide			
experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the			
Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess			
experience working with public agencies to provide similar			
services.		i	
 Compliance with election code § 14111. 			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates:			-
References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of			
the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to			
provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE	5	3	15
AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT			
<u> </u>			
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;			
 RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; 			
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no			
exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		300
Total Weig	ghted Possil	ole Score	500
Converted to	100 point sc	core total	60



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Daniel Shamebo Sabore DBA Languages Translation Services

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the			
same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
• Accuracy			
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
Formatting			į
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates:			
Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	2	20
Proposal demonstrates:			20
Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide			
experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the		1	
Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess			
experience working with public agencies to provide similar			
services.	-		
 Compliance with election code § 14111. 			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates:			
References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of			
the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to			
provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
edes extrata sana, est fa in estantidad a filman i an invitata, est fa la elementa in estantidad de inter-			
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; 			
RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no			
exceptions noted.		į	
Respondent Total	100		290
	ghted Possik		500
Converted to	100 point sc	core total	58



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Geneva Worldwide, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
• Formatting		:	
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	4	20
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		335
Total Weig	hted Possik	ole Score	500
Converted to 1	100 point sc	ore total	67



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Geneva Worldwide, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
ConsistencyFormatting			
Formating			į
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		330
	hted Possibl		500
Converted to 1	00 point scc	re total	66



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Geneva Worldwide, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy • Completeness • Local/Cultural Sensitivity • Consistency • Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		360
	hted Possik		500
Converted to 1	00 point sc	ore total	72



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Hanna Interpreting Services LLC

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	5	150
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the			
same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
Accuracy			
• Completeness		i	
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates:			
Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;		ĺ	
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates:			
Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide			
experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the]		
Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess			
experience working with public agencies to provide similar			
services.	1	ł	
Compliance with election code § 14111.		i	
REFERENCES	5	5	25
Proposal demonstrates:			
References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of			
the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to]		
provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE	5	5	25
AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL			20
CONTRACT			74
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; 	,		
RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no			
exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		420
Total Weig	ghted Possib	e Score	500
Converted to	100 point sc	ore total	84



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Hanna Interpreting Services LLC

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy • Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	4	20
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	4	20
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		360
	ghted Possil		500
Converted to	100 point sc	core total	72



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Hanna Interpreting Services LLC

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;		 	
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	4	20
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	5	25
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		375
	ghted Possik		500
Converted to	100 point sc	core total	75



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Interpreters Unlimited, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	5	150
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the	2 (1986 to 1 1991 - 1994 et to 1 1994 et to		
same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
• Accuracy			
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity Consistency			
Formatting	1 1		
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates:			
Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	5	
Proposal demonstrates:	10	5	50
 Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide 		:	
experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the			
Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess		i	
experience working with public agencies to provide similar			
services.			
Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES			
	5	4	20
Proposal demonstrates:			
References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of			
the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to	ĺ,		
provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	5	25
	<u>nuka lan Minus d</u>		
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; 			
RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no			
exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		405
	hted Possibl		500
Converted to 1	00 point sco	ore total	81



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Interpreters Unlimited, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	4	20
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		345
Total Weig	hted Possil	ole Score	500
Converted to	100 point sc	core total	69

ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
• Accuracy			
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	5	25
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no 			
exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		360
Total Weig	ghted Possik	ole Score	500
Converted to	100 point sc	ore total	72



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Interpreters Unlimited, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: LinguaLinx Language Solutions, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	5	150
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



Preliminary Evaluation Scoring Sheet RFP # 031-C022384-CM ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the			
same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
• Accuracy	,		
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity Consistency			
ConsistencyFormatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates:	·		
Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION			
	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates:			
 Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the 			
Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess			
experience working with public agencies to provide similar services.		•	
Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	4	20
Proposal demonstrates:			
References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of			
the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to		}	
provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE	5	5	25
AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL			
CONTRACT			
	ľ		
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; 			
RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;	İ		
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no	Ì		
exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		435
	hted Possik		500
Converted to 1	00 point sc	ore total	87



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: LinguaLinx Language Solutions, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy • Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			l:
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	4	20
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		375
	phted Possil		500
Converted to	100 point sc	core total	75



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: LinguaLinx Language Solutions, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	5	25
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		380
	ghted Possi		500
Converted to	100 point sc	core total	76



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Linguava Interpreters, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	2	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy • Completeness • Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
Consistency Formatting			į
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	2	10
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no	-	,	
exceptions noted. Respondent Total	100	•	275
·	ghted Possik	ole Score	500
Converted to			55



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Linguava Interpreters, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	2	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
Accuracy			
Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			;
• Consistency			
Formatting			l.
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	2	20
Proposal demonstrates:	:		
Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	3	20
Proposal demonstrates:	10	3	30
Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide			
experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the			
Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess			
experience working with public agencies to provide similar			
services.			
Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates:			
References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of			i
the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to			
provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL	5	3	15
CONTRACT			
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;			
RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no			
exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		260
Total Weig	hted Possi	ble Score	500
Converted to 1	00 point so	core total	52



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Linguava Interpreters, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	2	20
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	2	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy • Completeness • Local/Cultural Sensitivity • Consistency • Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	2	20
Proposal demonstrates: Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		250
Total Weig			500
Converted to 1	00 point sc	core total	50



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Propio LS LLC

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			i
• Formatting			1
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	4	20
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			,
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	4	20
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		370
Total Weig	hted Possib	le Score	500
Converted to 1	00 point sc	ore total	74



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Propio LS LLC

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	2	20
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
Formatting			:
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	4	20
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
 instructions: Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		345
Total Weig	ghted Possil	ole Score	500
Converted to			69



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Propio LS LLC

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	2	20
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy • Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate; STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION			
	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services.			
Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	4	20
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			*
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		345
	ghted Possil		500
Converted to	100 point sc	core total	69



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Terra Translations LLC

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	1	10
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	1	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the			
same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
Accuracy			
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity Consister and			
ConsistencyFormatting			
Formatiling			ŀ
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	2	20
Proposal demonstrates:			
 Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate; 			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	1	10
Proposal demonstrates:			
 Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide]		
experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the			
Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess].		
experience working with public agencies to provide similar	1		
services.			
Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	1	5
Proposal demonstrates:			
References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of			
the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to			
provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE	5	3	15
AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL			
CONTRACT			
Completeness of response in general size a will DED			
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; 			
 RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; 			
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no			
exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		210
	hted Possibl	e Score	500
Converted to 1			42
33761164.16			74



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Terra Translations LLC

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	2	20
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	2	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
Consistency			
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	1	10
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	1	5
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		260
	ghted Possik		500
Converted to	100 point sc	ore total	52



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Terra Translations LLC

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	2	20
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	2	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			

ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
Consistency			
• Formatting			1
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	1	10
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	1	5
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:	,		
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		260
	ghted Possik		500
Converted to	100 point sc	core total	52



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Translation and Simultaneous Interpreting

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	2	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
Consistency			
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates:			:
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		310
Total Weig	ghted Possik	ole Score	500
Converted to	100 point sc	ore total	62



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Translation and Simultaneous Interpreting

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	. 3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	2	60
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy • Completeness • Local/Cultural Sensitivity • Consistency • Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	. 3	30
TROI GGES GOMI ENGAIION 10 GOGNT	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	3	15
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	·		300
	ghted Possik		500
Converted to	100 point sc	ore total	60



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Translation and Simultaneous Interpreting

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	3	90
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
CompletenessLocal/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	2	10
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	4	20
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		340
	hted Possil		500
Converted to 1	00 point so	core total	68



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: TransPerfect Translations International, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	5	150
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.	•		



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES 30 4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the	120
same score based on the SMEs evaluation)	
Accuracy	
• Completeness	
Local/Cultural Sensitivity	
• Consistency	
• Formatting	
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY 10 2	20
Proposal demonstrates:	į.
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;	
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION 10 5	50
Proposal demonstrates:	30
Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide	
experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the	
Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess	
experience working with public agencies to provide similar	
services.	
Compliance with election code § 14111.	
REFERENCES 5 5	25
Proposal demonstrates:	
References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of	
the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to	
provide the requested services.	
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE 5	25
AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL	
CONTRACT	
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP	
instructions:	
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; 	
RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;	
Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no	İ
exceptions noted.	
Respondent Total 100	430
Total Weighted Possible Score	500
Converted to 100 point score total	86



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: TransPerfect Translations International, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy • Completeness • Local/Cultural Sensitivity • Consistency • Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	2	20
Proposal demonstrates: Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION Proposal demonstrates:	10	4	40
 Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. Compliance with election code § 14111. 			
REFERENCES	5	4	20
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	5	25
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		375
	hted Possib		500
Converted to 1	00 point sc	ore total	75



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: TransPerfect Translations International, Inc.

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			

ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy • Completeness • Local/Cultural Sensitivity • Consistency			
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates: Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	4	20
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	4	20
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		380
	hted Possik		500
Converted to 1	00 point sc	ore total	76



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: United Language Group

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	5	150
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
CompletenessLocal/Cultural Sensitivity			
Consistency		•	
Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	5	25
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	5	25
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		450
	hted Possib		500
Converted to 1	00 point sc	ore total	90



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: United Language Group

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	4	120
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) • Accuracy			
• Completeness			
Local/Cultural Sensitivity			
• Consistency			
• Formatting			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates:			
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	5	25
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	5	25
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		430
Total Weig	ghted Possib	le Score	500
Converted to	100 point sco	ore total	86



ATTACHMENT D

Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: United Language Group

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies, County of Orange, and/or elections offices; • Demonstrated experience meeting deadlines.			
PROJECT APPROACH	30	5	150
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work; • Comprehensive work plan that considers County's Phase timelines (Figure 1); • Reasonable methodology for determining word counts, inclusions, and exclusions; • Reasonable timelines for initial translations, multiple changes, and single changes; • Reasonable approach to address County's concerns regarding questionable translations; • Reasonable timeline for emergency requests; • Quality control methods; • Translation process is efficient and effective; • Evidence of good organizational and best management practices.			·



ATTACHMENT D

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation)			
• Accuracy			
CompletenessLocal/Cultural Sensitivity			İ
Consistency			
• Formatting			
<u> </u>			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	4	40
Proposal demonstrates:			į.
Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;			1
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • Compliance with election code § 14111.			
REFERENCES	5	5	25
Proposal demonstrates: References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	5	25
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
 Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted. 			
Respondent Total	100		460
Total Weig	ghted Possik	ole Score	500
Converted to	100 point sc	ore total	92

Final Scoring Summary RFP #031-C022384-CM - Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Criteria Weight Proposer: Corporate Translation Services, Inc. DBA Language Link							Score	Weighted			
Written Criteria	75%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5		Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	5	10	5	10	5	10				6	5
Project Approach	30%	3	18	4	24	4	24				13	10
Written Translation Samples	30%	4	24	4	24	4	24				14	11
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	4	8	4	8	5	10				5	4
Staffing and Organization	10%	5	10	5	10	5	10				6	5
References	5%	5	5	5	5	5	5				3	2
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	4	4	5	5	5	5				3	2
Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%	30.0	79.0	32.0	86.0	33.0	88.0				51	38
Oral Criteria	25%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5			
Process / Workflow	20%	5	20	5	20	5	20				12	3
Translation Quality	20%	5	20	5	20	4	16				11	3
Resolving Translation Errors	20%	4	16	4	16	4	16				10	2
Meeting Deadlines	20%	5	20	5	20	5	20				12	3
Billing / Invoicing	20%	4	16	4	16	3	12				9	2
Oral Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%	23.0	92.0	23.0	92.0	21.0	84.0				54	13

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer:	oposer: United Language Group						Score	Weighted	
Written Criteria	75%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	Panel #5	Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%	5	10	5	10	5	10			6	5
Project Approach	30%	5	30	4	24	5	30			17	13
Written Translation Samples	30%	4	24	4	24	4	24			14	11
Proposed Compensation to County	10%	3	6	4	8	4	8			4	3
Staffing and Organization	10%	5	10	5	10	5	10			6	5
References	5%	5	5	5	5	5	5			3	2
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%	5	5	5	5	5	5			3	2
We'tten Brown and Frederick on March Frederick (1997)	4000/	20.0	00.0	20.0	00.0	20.0	00.0				40
Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%		32.0	90.0	32.0	86.0	33.0	92.0			54	40
Oral Criteria	25%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4	 Panel #5		
Process / Workflow	20%	5	20	5	20	5	20			12	3
Translation Quality	20%	5	20	5	20	5	20			12	3
Resolving Translation Errors	20%	5	20	5	20	5	20			12	3
Meeting Deadlines	20%	5	20	5	20	5	20			12	3
Billing / Invoicing	20%	5	20	5	20	5	20			12	3
Oral Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	4000/	25.0	400.0	25.0	400.0	25.0	100.0			60	15
Oral Froposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%	25.0	100.0	25.0	100.0	25.0	100.0			60	15



ATTACHMENT D

Proposer's Name: Corporate Translation Services, Inc. DBA Language Link

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)		
Process/Workflow	20	5	100		
 Describe the steps from initial service request to delivery of final translation. 					
Translation Quality	20	5	100		
 Ensuring translations are accurate, consistent and appropriate for Orange County. Including how errors are corrected and County word preferences are added and addressed during the translation periods. 					
Resolvoing Translation Errors	20	4	80		
Including your internal process for tracking and ensuring the error is not repeated with multiple translators etc.					
Meeting Deadlines	20	5	100		
Especially during peak periods when the volume is significantly higher					
Billing/Invoicing	20	4	80		
How words are counted					
Respondent Total	100		460		
Total Weighted Possible Score					
Converted to 1	00 point sc	ore total	92		



ATTACHMENT D

Proposer's Name: Corporate Translation Services, Inc. DBA Language Link

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)		
Process/Workflow	20	5	100		
 Describe the steps from initial service request to delivery of final translation. 					
Translation Quality	20	5	100		
 Ensuring translations are accurate, consistent and appropriate for Orange County. Including how errors are corrected and County word preferences are added and addressed during the translation periods. 					
Resolvoing Translation Errors	20	4	80		
Including your internal process for tracking and ensuring the error is not repeated with multiple translators etc.					
Meeting Deadlines	20	5	100		
Especially during peak periods when the volume is significantly higher					
Billing/Invoicing	20	4	80		
How words are counted					
Respondent Total	100		460		
Total Weighted Possible Score					
Converted to 1	00 point sc	ore total	92		



ATTACHMENT D

Proposer's Name: Corporate Translation Services, Inc. DBA Language Link

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Process/Workflow	20	5	100
 Describe the steps from initial service request to delivery of final translation. 			
Translation Quality	20	4	80
 Ensuring translations are accurate, consistent and appropriate for Orange County. Including how errors are corrected and County word preferences are added and addressed during the translation periods. 			
Resolvoing Translation Errors	20	4	80
Including your internal process for tracking and ensuring the error is not repeated with multiple translators etc.		·	
Meeting Deadlines	20	5	100
Especially during peak periods when the volume is significantly higher	Total of Williams Windows		100
Billing/Invoicing	20	3	60
How words are counted			
Respondent Total	100		420
Total Weig	hted Possib	le Score	500
Converted to 1			84



ATTACHMENT D

Proposer's Name: United Language Group

Evaluator Number: 1

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)		
Process/Workflow	20	5	100		
 Describe the steps from initial service request to delivery of final translation. 					
Translation Quality	20	5	100		
 Ensuring translations are accurate, consistent and appropriate for Orange County. Including how errors are corrected and County word preferences are added and addressed during the translation periods. 					
Resolvoing Translation Errors	20	5	100		
Including your internal process for tracking and ensuring the error is not repeated with multiple translators etc.					
Meeting Deadlines	20	5	100		
Especially during peak periods when the volume is significantly higher					
Billing/Invoicing	20	5	100		
How words are counted	The second section of the second section of the second section				
Respondent Total	100		500		
Total Weighted Possible Score					
Converted to 1	00 point sc	ore total	100		



ATTACHMENT D

Proposer's Name: United Language Group

Evaluator Number: 2

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)			
Process/Workflow	20	5	100			
• Describe the steps from initial service request to delivery of final translation.						
Translation Quality	20	5	100			
 Ensuring translations are accurate, consistent and appropriate for Orange County. Including how errors are corrected and County word preferences are added and addressed during the translation periods. 						
Resolvoing Translation Errors	20	5	100			
Including your internal process for tracking and ensuring the error is not repeated with multiple translators etc.						
Meeting Deadlines	20	5	100			
Especially during peak periods when the volume is significantly higher	a fini na fini na fini na fi		-			
Billing/Invoicing	20	5	100			
How words are counted						
Respondent Total	100		500			
Total Weig	Total Weighted Possible Score					
Converted to 1	00 point sc	ore total	100			



ATTACHMENT D

Proposer's Name: United Language Group

Evaluator Number: 3

Weight: Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.

Score: Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows:

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)			
Process/Workflow	20	5	100			
• Describe the steps from initial service request to delivery of final translation.						
Translation Quality	20	5	100			
 Ensuring translations are accurate, consistent and appropriate for Orange County. Including how errors are corrected and County word preferences are added and addressed during the translation periods. 						
Resolvoing Translation Errors	20	5	100			
Including your internal process for tracking and ensuring the error is not repeated with multiple translators etc.						
Meeting Deadlines	20	5	100			
Especially during peak periods when the volume is significantly higher						
Billing/Invoicing	20	5	100			
How words are counted						
Respondent Total	100		500			
Total Weighted Possible Score						
Converted to 1	00 point sc	ore total	100			