

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer: Accent on Languages, 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 DBA inlingua Utah										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 Interpreting & Translations, 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	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 Translation Services, Inc. DBA Language Link										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 International, 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 Shamebo Sabore DBA Languages Translation Services										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 Worldwide, 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

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer: Hanna Interpreting Services 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 100%	100%	29.0	81.0	24.0	69.0	26.0	72.0					74	74

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer: LinguaLinx Language Solutions, 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	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 Interpreters, 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	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 LLC										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: 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 Simultaneous Interpreting										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: TransPerfect Translations International 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: 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:										Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	100%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5		Percentage	Score
Experience and Expertise	10%												
Project Approach	30%												
Written Translation Samples	30%												
Proposed Compensation to County	10%												
Staffing and Organization	10%												
References	5%												
Proposal Organization/Completeness	5%												
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%											0	0



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: Accent on Languages, 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	2	20
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	2	10
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			54



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			64



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			56



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			59



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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			59



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			62



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			76



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			66



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			73



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			77



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
<p>Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy • Completeness • Local/Cultural Sensitivity • Consistency • Formatting 			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	5	50
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <p>Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;</p>			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <p>References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</p>			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	4	20
<p>Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; <p>Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</p>			
Respondent Total	100		335
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			67



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			71



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	4	20
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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		395
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			79



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			86



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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			88



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			68



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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			62



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			69



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			63



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			60



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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	2	20
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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		290
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			58



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			67



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			66



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			72



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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			84



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
<p>Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy • Completeness • Local/Cultural Sensitivity • Consistency • Formatting 			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate; 			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <p>References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</p>			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	4	20
<p>Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; <p>Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</p>			
Respondent Total	100		360
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			72



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			75



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			81



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			69



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			72



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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		435
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			87



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

Proposer's Name: LingualLinux 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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			75



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			76



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
<p>Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy • Completeness • Local/Cultural Sensitivity • Consistency • Formatting 			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	3	30
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <p>Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;</p>			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	4	40
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <p>References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</p>			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	2	10
<p>Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; <p>Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</p>			
Respondent Total	100		275
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			55



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			52



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	3	90
<p>Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy • Completeness • Local/Cultural Sensitivity • Consistency • Formatting 			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	2	20
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <p>Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;</p>			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	3	30
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <p>References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</p>			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
<p>Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; <p>Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</p>			
Respondent Total	100		250
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			50



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			74



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			69



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
<p>Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy • Completeness • Local/Cultural Sensitivity • Consistency • Formatting 			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	5	50
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <p>Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;</p>			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	3	30
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <p>References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</p>			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	3	15
<p>Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; <p>Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</p>			
Respondent Total	100		345
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			69



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:

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	1	10
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	1	10
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			42



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			52



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			52



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			62



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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			60



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			68



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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			86



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	4	40
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			75



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:

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			76



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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	5	50
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			90



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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			86



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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.			



Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

WRITTEN TRANSLATION SAMPLES	30	4	120
<p>Samples: (Per evaluation by SMEs; all evaluators use the same score based on the SMEs evaluation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy • Completeness • Local/Cultural Sensitivity • Consistency • Formatting 			
PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO COUNTY	10	4	40
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <p>Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;</p>			
STAFFING AND ORGANIZATION	10	5	50
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
<p>Proposal demonstrates:</p> <p>References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</p>			
PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	5	5	25
<p>Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; <p>Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</p>			
Respondent Total	100		460
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			92

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
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%												51	

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer: 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
Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	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%	100%	25.0	100.0	25.0	100.0	25.0	100.0					60	15



Preliminary Evaluation Scoring Sheet
RFP # 031-C022384-CM Oral Presentations -
Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

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: 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.			
Resolving 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			500
Converted to 100 point score total			92



Preliminary Evaluation Scoring Sheet
RFP # 031-C022384-CM Oral Presentations -
Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

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.			
Resolving 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			500
Converted to 100 point score total			92



Preliminary Evaluation Scoring Sheet
RFP # 031-C022384-CM Oral Presentations -
Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

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:

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	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.			
Resolving 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	3	60
• How words are counted			
Respondent Total	100		420
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			84



Preliminary Evaluation Scoring Sheet
RFP # 031-C022384-CM Oral Presentations -
Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

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:

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.			
Resolving 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			500
Converted to 100 point score total			100



Preliminary Evaluation Scoring Sheet
RFP # 031-C022384-CM Oral Presentations -
Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

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:

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.			
Resolving 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			500
Converted to 100 point score total			100



Preliminary Evaluation Scoring Sheet
RFP # 031-C022384-CM Oral Presentations -
Written Translation of Ballots and Other Election Materials

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:

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.			
Resolving 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			500
Converted to 100 point score total			100