

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer: ES&S														Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	70%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5		Panel #6		Panel #7		Percentage	Score
Qualifications and Related Experience	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.29	5.80
Proposed Staffing and Key Personnel	10%	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.00	5.60
Work Plan/Project Approach	60%	2.00	24.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	34.29	24.00
Cost of Proposal	10%	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	6.00	4.20
Proposal Organization/Completeness; Degree of Compliance with Co Contract	10%	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	4.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	6.86	4.80
Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%	18.00	56.00	18.00	66.00	17.00	64.00	18.00	66.00	17.00	64.00	17.00	64.00	17.00	64.00	63.43	44.40
Oral Criteria	30%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5		Panel #6		Panel #7			
Qualifications and Related Experience	10%	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	9.14	2.74
Proposed Staffing and Key Personnel	10%	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.86	2.66
Work Plan/Project Approach	60%	3.00	36.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	46.29	13.89
Cost of Proposal	10%	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	6.00	1.80
Proposal Organization/Completeness; Degree of Compliance with Co Contract	10%	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.57	2.57
Oral Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%	21.00	72.00	22.00	84.00	19.00	78.00	19.00	78.00	21.00	82.00	19.00	78.00	20.00	80.00	78.86	23.66
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%																68.06	

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer: Hart														Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	70%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5		Panel #6		Panel #7		Percentage	Score
Qualifications and Related Experience	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.57	6.00
Proposed Staffing and Key Personnel	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.57	6.00
Work Plan/Project Approach	60%	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	5.00	60.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	49.71	34.80
Cost of Proposal	10%	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	10.00	7.00
Proposal Organization/Completeness; Degree of Compliance with Co Contract	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.57	6.00
Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%	24.00	88.00	21.00	82.00	25.00	100.00	21.00	82.00	21.00	82.00	21.00	82.00	21.00	82.00	85.43	59.80
Oral Criteria	30%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5		Panel #6		Panel #7			
Qualifications and Related Experience	10%	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	9.71	2.91
Proposed Staffing and Key Personnel	10%	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	9.71	2.91
Work Plan/Project Approach	60%	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	48.00	14.40
Cost of Proposal	10%	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	10.00	3.00
Proposal Organization/Completeness; Degree of Compliance with Co Contract	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	8.86	2.66
Oral Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%	24.00	88.00	23.00	86.00	24.00	88.00	21.00	82.00	23.00	86.00	23.00	86.00	24.00	88.00	86.29	25.89
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%																85.69	

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer: Dominion														Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	70%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5		Panel #6		Panel #7		Percentage	Score
Qualifications and Related Experience	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.29	5.80
Proposed Staffing and Key Personnel	10%	4.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	4.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	4.00	8.00	6.86	4.80
Work Plan/Project Approach	60%	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	4.00	48.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	37.71	26.40
Cost of Proposal	10%	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.00	5.60
Proposal Organization/Completeness; Degree of Compliance with Co Contract	10%	4.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	4.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	6.57	4.60
Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%	20.00	70.00	17.00	64.00	17.00	64.00	20.00	80.00	17.00	64.00	17.00	64.00	18.00	66.00	67.43	47.20
Oral Criteria	30%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5		Panel #6		Panel #7			
Qualifications and Related Experience	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.29	2.49
Proposed Staffing and Key Personnel	10%	4.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	7.43	2.23
Work Plan/Project Approach	60%	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	36.00	10.80
Cost of Proposal	10%	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.00	2.40
Proposal Organization/Completeness; Degree of Compliance with Co Contract	10%	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	4.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	6.29	1.89
Oral Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%	19.00	68.00	17.00	64.00	17.00	64.00	19.00	68.00	18.00	66.00	18.00	66.00	18.00	66.00	66.00	19.80
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%																67.00	

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer: Runbeck														Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	70%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5		Panel #6		Panel #7		Percentage	Score
Qualifications and Related Experience	10%	2.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	6.00	4.86	3.40
Proposed Staffing and Key Personnel	10%	2.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	2.86	2.00
Work Plan/Project Approach	60%	1.00	12.00	1.00	12.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	12.00	1.00	12.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	12.00	8.57	6.00
Cost of Proposal	10%	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.40
Proposal Organization/Completeness; Degree of Compliance with Co Contract	10%	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	1.71	1.20
Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%	7.00	24.00	6.00	22.00	5.00	10.00	7.00	24.00	8.00	26.00	4.00	8.00	8.00	26.00	20.00	14.00
Oral Criteria	30%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5		Panel #6		Panel #7			
Qualifications and Related Experience	10%																
Proposed Staffing and Key Personnel	10%																
Work Plan/Project Approach	60%																
Cost of Proposal	10%																
Proposal Organization/Completeness; Degree of Compliance with Co Contract	10%																
Oral Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%															0.00	0.00
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%																14.00	

Final Scoring Summary  
RFP #031-C022406-KG Category C – Central County Scanning and Tabulation

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer: ES&S														Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	70%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5		Panel #6		Panel #7		Percentage	Score
Qualifications and Related Experience	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.29	5.80
Proposed Staffing and Key Personnel	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.29	5.80
Work Plan/Project Approach	60%	2.00	24.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	34.29	24.00
Cost of Proposal	10%	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.00	5.60
Proposal Organization/Completeness; Degree of Compliance	10%	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	7.71	5.40
Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%	20.00	60.00	19.00	68.00	19.00	68.00	19.00	68.00	18.00	66.00	19.00	68.00	19.00	68.00	66.57	46.60
Oral Criteria	30%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5		Panel #6		Panel #7			
Qualifications and Related Experience	10%	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	9.71	2.91
Proposed Staffing and Key Personnel	10%	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	9.71	2.91
Work Plan/Project Approach	60%	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	3.00	36.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	46.29	13.89
Cost of Proposal	10%	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.00	2.40
Proposal Organization/Completeness; Degree of Compliance	10%	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.57	2.57
Oral Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%	23.00	86.00	23.00	86.00	21.00	72.00	20.00	80.00	22.00	84.00	22.00	84.00	22.00	84.00	82.29	24.69
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%															71.29	

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer: Hart														Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	70%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5		Panel #6		Panel #7		Percentage	Score
Qualifications and Related Experience	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.57	6.00
Proposed Staffing and Key Personnel	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.57	6.00
Work Plan/Project Approach	60%	3.00	36.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	46.29	32.40
Cost of Proposal	10%	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	10.00	7.00
Proposal Organization/Completeness; Degree of Compliance	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.57	6.00
Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%	23.00	76.00	21.00	82.00	24.00	88.00	21.00	82.00	21.00	82.00	21.00	82.00	21.00	82.00	82.00	57.40
Oral Criteria	30%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5		Panel #6		Panel #7			
Qualifications and Related Experience	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	9.14	2.74
Proposed Staffing and Key Personnel	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	9.14	2.74
Work Plan/Project Approach	60%	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	4.00	48.00	3.00	36.00	42.86	12.86
Cost of Proposal	10%	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	10.00	10.00	3.00
Proposal Organization/Completeness; Degree of Compliance	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.29	2.49
Oral Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%	23.00	76.00	20.00	70.00	23.00	86.00	21.00	82.00	21.00	82.00	23.00	86.00	22.00	74.00	79.43	23.83
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%															81.23	

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Proposer: Dominion														Score	Weighted
Written Criteria	70%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5		Panel #6		Panel #7		Percentage	Score
Qualifications and Related Experience	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.57	6.00
Proposed Staffing and Key Personnel	10%	4.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	4.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	7.14	5.00
Work Plan/Project Approach	60%	4.00	48.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	4.00	48.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	39.43	27.60
Cost of Proposal	10%	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	6.00	4.20
Proposal Organization/Completeness; Degree of Compliance	10%	4.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	4.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	6.57	4.60
Written Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%	20.00	80.00	16.00	62.00	17.00	64.00	19.00	78.00	16.00	62.00	17.00	64.00	17.00	64.00	67.71	47.40
Oral Criteria	30%	Panel #1		Panel #2		Panel #3		Panel #4		Panel #5		Panel #6		Panel #7			
Qualifications and Related Experience	10%	5.00	10.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	8.29	2.49
Proposed Staffing and Key Personnel	10%	4.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	8.00	7.71	2.31
Work Plan/Project Approach	60%	4.00	48.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	3.00	36.00	4.00	48.00	3.00	36.00	39.43	11.83
Cost of Proposal	10%	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	6.00	1.80
Proposal Organization/Completeness; Degree of Compliance	10%	4.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	4.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	6.00	4.00	8.00	6.86	2.06
Oral Proposal Evaluation - Must Equal 100%	100%	20.00	80.00	16.00	62.00	17.00	64.00	18.00	66.00	17.00	64.00	18.00	76.00	18.00	66.00	68.29	20.49
Grand Total - Must Equal 100%	100%															67.89	



Individual Evaluator Score Sheet  
RFP-031-C022406-KG  
Voting Systems

Attachment C

Respondent:	
Evaluator Number:	

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li><li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li><li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li></ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li></ul>		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li><li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li><li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li><li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li></ul></li><li>• Matrix Requirements<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li><li>-Application Software and Integration</li><li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li><li>-Documentation and System Administration</li><li>-Training</li></ul></li></ul>		2	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li><li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li></ul>		3	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



Individual Evaluator Score Sheet  
RFP-031-C022406-KG  
Voting Systems

Attachment C

Respondent:	2
Evaluator Number:	1

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *INGHEN*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li><li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li><li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li></ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li></ul>		5	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li><li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li><li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li><li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li></ul></li><li>• Matrix Requirements</li><li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li><li>-Application Software and Integration</li><li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li><li>-Documentation and System Administration</li><li>-Training</li></ul>		4	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li><li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li></ul>		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		5	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	3
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	1

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		3	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		4	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



Individual Evaluator Score Sheet  
RFP-031-C022406-KG  
Voting Systems

Attachment C

Respondent:	4
Evaluator Number:	1

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li><li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li><li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li></ul>		2	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li></ul>		2	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li><li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li><li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li><li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li></ul></li><li>• Matrix Requirements</li><li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li><li>-Application Software and Integration</li><li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li><li>-Documentation and System Administration</li><li>-Training</li></ul>		1	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li><li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li></ul>		1	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>			
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	1
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	2

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		3	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		3	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	2
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	2

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		4	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>2</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		<b>3</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		<b>3</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	4
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	2

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		2	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		1	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		1	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		1	



Individual Evaluator Score Sheet  
RFP-031-C022406-KG  
Voting Systems

Attachment C

PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	10	0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		1	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	1
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	3

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		4	
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		4	
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		3	
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		3	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:		3	
• 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		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>3</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>	0	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>	0	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>	60	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>	10	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		5	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>3</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>	10	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSAL MANAGER AND KEY PERSONNEL:</b>	10	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		3	
<b>WORKING PROPOSAL APPROACH:</b>	60	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		3	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL (Proposed Price):</b>	10	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		4	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	4
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	3

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL DEDICATED TO VOTING SYSTEMS</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		2	
<b>PROPOSAL DEDICATED TO VOTING SYSTEMS</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		1	
<b>SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE APPROACH</b>	50	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		0	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		1	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		1	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	1
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	4

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		4	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		3	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		3	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<u>2</u>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<u>4</u>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** Written

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		<u>4</u>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		<u>4</u>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		<u>4</u>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		<u>5</u>	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

<b>Respondent:</b>	3
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	4

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		4	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		4	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		-4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

<b>Respondent:</b>	4
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	4

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li><li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li><li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li></ul>		3	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li></ul>		1	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li><li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li><li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li><li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li></ul></li><li>• Matrix Requirements</li><li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li><li>-Application Software and Integration</li><li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li><li>-Documentation and System Administration</li><li>-Training</li></ul>		1	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li><li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li></ul>		1	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		1	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>5</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		<b>3</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		<b>3</b>	



Individual Evaluator Score Sheet  
RFP-031-C022406-KG  
Voting Systems

Attachment C

PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	10	0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>5</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *12/14/17*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		<b>5</b>	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>5</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		<b>3</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		<b>3</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>5</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		<b>3</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		<b>2</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		<b>1</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		<b>1</b>	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		1	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	1
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	6

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		3	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		3	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total		100	0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>6</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		<b>4</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		<b>4</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		<b>4</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		<b>5</b>	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>6</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		<b>4</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		<b>3</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		<b>3</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		<b>4</b>	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	4
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	6

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		2	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		1	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		0	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		1	



Individual Evaluator Score Sheet  
RFP-031-C022406-KG  
Voting Systems

Attachment C

PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	10	0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		0	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>7</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		4	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		4	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		3	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		3	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; • Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.		3	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>7</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		4	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>7</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Wn 4m*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATION AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		<b>4</b>	
<b>PERSONNEL AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		<b>4</b>	
<b>APPROACH/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		<b>3</b>	
<b>COST PROPOSAL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		<b>4</b>	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:		3	
• 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		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>7</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		3	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		2	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH:</b>		0	0
<b>Proposal demonstrates:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		1	
<b>PROPOSAL PRICING:</b>		0	0
<b>Proposal demonstrates:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		1	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; • Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.		1	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *DM*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		<i>5</i>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		<i>5</i>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		<i>3</i>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		<i>3</i>	



Individual Evaluator Score Sheet  
RFP-031-C022406-KG  
Voting Systems

Attachment C

PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	10	0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		5	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



Individual Evaluator Score Sheet  
RFP-031-C022406-KG  
Voting Systems

Attachment C

Respondent:	
Evaluator Number:	

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *07/11*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li><li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li><li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li></ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li></ul>		5	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li><li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li><li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li><li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li></ul></li><li>• Matrix Requirements</li><li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li><li>-Application Software and Integration</li><li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li><li>-Documentation and System Administration</li><li>-Training</li></ul>		4	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li><li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li></ul>		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		5	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	3
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	1

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *oral*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		5	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		3	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		4	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	/
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	2

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *ora*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>	10	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>	10	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>	60	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>	10	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		3	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		5	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<u>2</u>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<u>2</u>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** ORA

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		5	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		5	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		4	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		4	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<u>3</u>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<u>2</u>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** OM

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL DEDUPLICATION</b>		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		4	
<b>PROPOSAL DEDUPLICATION</b>		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		3	
<b>PROPOSAL PROBLEMS</b>		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		3	
<b>PROPOSAL PROPOSED COST</b>		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		4	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;			
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;		3	
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total		100	0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>3</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Oral*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		4	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		4	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		4	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		3	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:		4	
• 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		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>3</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *oral*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		5	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		5	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		5	

*oral*



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		5	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>3</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions**

*Oral*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		<i>4</i>	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		<i>3</i>	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		<i>3</i>	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		<i>4</i>	

*Oral*



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		3	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	1
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	4

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *oral*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		4	
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		4	
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		3	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	2
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	4

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *byvml*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		5	





Individual Evaluator Score Sheet  
RFP-031-C022406-KG  
Voting Systems

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		4	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total		100	0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>4</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Oru*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		3	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		4	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; • Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>5</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Oral*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		<b>5</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		<b>5</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		<b>3</b>	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	2
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	5

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *mal*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		4	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	3
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	5

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Oral*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		3	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		4	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	1
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	6

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Orad*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		4	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL / Proposed Fee</b>	10	0	0
<b>Proposal demonstrates:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		3	



Individual Evaluator Score Sheet  
RFP-031-C022406-KG  
Voting Systems

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		4	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<u>2</u>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<u>6</u>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** onl

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		<u>5</u>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		<u>5</u>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		<u>4</u>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		<u>5</u>	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>6</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *and*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:                -Familiarity with the services requested                -Resources clearly identified for each task                -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> <li>• Matrix Requirements                -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance                -Application Software and Integration                -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach                -Documentation and System Administration                -Training</li> </ul>		<b>3</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	1
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	7

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *Oral*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		5	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		3	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;			
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;		4	
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total		100	0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	2
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	7

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** ORA

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>	10	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>	20	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>WORK PLAN/IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH</b>	40	0	0
<b>Proposal demonstrates:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>	10	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		5	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total		100	0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>7</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**B = Vote Center Voting Solutions** *OMM*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		3	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		4	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total		100	0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *WMM*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		<i>5</i>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		<i>5</i>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		<i>2</i>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		<i>4</i>	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	2
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates:			
• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;		5	
• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;			
• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.			
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates:			
• Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services.		5	
• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.			
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates:			
• Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work;		3	
• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:			
-Familiarity with the services requested			
-Resources clearly identified for each task			
-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS			
• Matrix Requirements			
-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance			
-Application Software and Integration			
-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach			
-Documentation and System Administration			
-Training			
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates:			
-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.		5	
-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.			





Individual Evaluator Score Sheet  
RFP-031-C022406-KG  
Voting Systems

Attachment C

PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	10	0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		5	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	3
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	1

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		5	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		4	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		3	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



Individual Evaluator Score Sheet  
RFP-031-C022406-KG  
Voting Systems

Attachment C

Respondent:	1
Evaluator Number:	2

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation *with on*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li><li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li><li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li></ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li></ul>		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li><li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li><li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li><li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li></ul></li><li>• Matrix Requirements</li><li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li><li>-Application Software and Integration</li><li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li><li>-Documentation and System Administration</li><li>-Training</li></ul>		3	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li><li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li></ul>		4	



Individual Evaluator Score Sheet  
RFP-031-C022406-KG  
Voting Systems

Attachment C

PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	10	0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	2
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	2

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *WMLM*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		4	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		4	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	3
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	2

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		3	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		3	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		3	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		3	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total		100	0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	1
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	3

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *WOTEN*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		3	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		4	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		4	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>3</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		5	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>3</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		3	
<b>WORKING SYSTEM APPROACH:</b>	60	0	0
<b>Proposal demonstrates:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		3	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Costs:</b>	40	0	0
<b>Proposal demonstrates:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		3	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	1
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	4

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		4	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		3	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		4	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	2
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	7

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li><li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li><li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li></ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li></ul>		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li><li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li><li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li><li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li></ul></li><li>• Matrix Requirements</li><li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li><li>-Application Software and Integration</li><li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li><li>-Documentation and System Administration</li><li>-Training</li></ul>		4	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li><li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li></ul>		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>4</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li><li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li><li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li></ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li></ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li><li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li><li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li><li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li></ul></li><li>• Matrix Requirements</li><li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li><li>-Application Software and Integration</li><li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li><li>-Documentation and System Administration</li><li>-Training</li></ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li><li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li></ul>		<b>3</b>	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	1
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	5

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		<b>4</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		<b>4</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		<b>3</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		<b>4</b>	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>5</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		<b>5</b>	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>5</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		<b>4</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		<b>3</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		<b>3</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		<b>3</b>	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	1
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	6

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		4	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		4	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		3	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL</b>		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		4	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		4	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<u>2</u>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<u>4</u>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** written

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/ APPROACH</b>		0	0
<b>Proposal demonstrates:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		4	
<b>COST PROPOSAL/ Proposed Price</b>		0	0
<b>Proposal demonstrates:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		4	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total		100	0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>6</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		4	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		4	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		3	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		3	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		3	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total		100	0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	1
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	7

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL PRESENTATION</b>		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		4	
<b>PROPOSAL QUALIFICATIONS</b>		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		4	
<b>PROPOSAL TECHNICAL APPROACH</b>		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		3	
<b>PROPOSAL COST PROPOSITION</b>		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		4	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		4	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	8
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	7

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
<b>Proposal demonstrates:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		4	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL/ Proposed Costs</b>	40	0	0
<b>Proposal demonstrates:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		4	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>7</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *Written*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATION AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		4	
<b>MANAGEMENT AND PERSONNEL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		3	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Price</b>	20	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		3	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *mal*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		<i>5</i>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		<i>5</i>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		<i>4</i>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		<i>4</i>	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		5	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	2
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	1

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *ORU*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		3	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		5	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	3
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	1

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *om*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		4	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		3	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



Individual Evaluator Score Sheet  
RFP-031-C022406-KG  
Voting Systems

Attachment C

Respondent:	1
Evaluator Number:	2

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation *only*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		5	
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		5	
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		4	
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		4	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		5	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<u>2</u>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<u>2</u>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** on

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		4	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		4	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		3	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		5	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total		100	0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



Individual Evaluator Score Sheet  
RFP-031-C022406-KG  
Voting Systems

Attachment C

Respondent:	3
Evaluator Number:	2

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *OK*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li><li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li><li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li></ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li></ul>		3	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	60	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li><li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li><li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li><li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li></ul></li><li>• Matrix Requirements</li><li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li><li>-Application Software and Integration</li><li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li><li>-Documentation and System Administration</li><li>-Training</li></ul>		3	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li><li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li></ul>		3	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>3</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *oral*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		3	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		4	

*oral*



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>3</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *CRM*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		5	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		5	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		4	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		5	

*oral*



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		✓	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>3</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *oral*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		3	
Proposal demonstrates:		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		3	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		3	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	1
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	4

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *oral*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li><li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li><li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li></ul>		4	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li></ul>		4	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li><li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li><li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li><li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li></ul></li><li>• Matrix Requirements</li><li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li><li>-Application Software and Integration</li><li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li><li>-Documentation and System Administration</li><li>-Training</li></ul>		4	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li><li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li></ul>		4	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total		100	0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	2
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	4

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *only*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		4	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	3
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	4

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *ccs*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li><li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li><li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li></ul>		4	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li></ul>		4	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li><li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li><li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li><li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li></ul></li><li>• Matrix Requirements</li><li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li><li>-Application Software and Integration</li><li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li><li>-Documentation and System Administration</li><li>-Training</li></ul>		3	
		0	0
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li><li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li></ul>		3	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>5</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *OM*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		<b>5</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		<b>5</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:                -Familiarity with the services requested                -Resources clearly identified for each task                -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> <li>• Matrix Requirements                -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance                -Application Software and Integration                -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach                -Documentation and System Administration                -Training</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	2
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	5

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *over*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		4	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		4	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>	4		
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>5</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *OMA*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		<b>3</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		<b>3</b>	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>6</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *ml*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		<b>5</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		<b>5</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	2
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	6

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *only*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements</li> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul>		4	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		5	





Individual Evaluator Score Sheet  
RFP-031-C022406-KG  
Voting Systems

Attachment C

PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT	10	0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>6</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *oral*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		<b>4</b>	
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		<b>4</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		<b>4</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposed Fees</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		<b>3</b>	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		3	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>7</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *ml*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		5	
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		5	
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		4	
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		4	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		4	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total		100	0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>7</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *one*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal;</li> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.</li> </ul>		5	
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b>		0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as detailed in the scope of work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the services requested</li> <li>-Resources clearly identified for each task</li> <li>-Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Matrix Requirements               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance</li> <li>-Application Software and Integration</li> <li>-Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach</li> <li>-Documentation and System Administration</li> <li>-Training</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		3	
<b>SOS REQUIRED FOR PROPOSAL:</b>	10	0	0
<b>PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method.</li> <li>-Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.</li> </ul>		5	



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li><li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;</li><li>• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li></ul>		4	
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0



**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evaluator Number:</b>	<b>7</b>

**Weight:** Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Request for Proposal.

**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

**C = Central Count Scanning and Tabulation** *one*

CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Offeror's Knowledge, Understanding, and Responsiveness to the Overall Proposal; • Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work; • Experience providing same/similar services and resources for public agencies.		<b>4</b>	
<b>PROPOSAL TEAM AND EXPERIENCE</b>	10	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services. • References submitted by Respondent provide evidence of the firm's expertise, experience, and qualifications to provide the requested services.		<b>4</b>	
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	40	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: • Understanding of project & objectives as detailed in the scope of work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: -Familiarity with the services requested -Resources clearly identified for each task -Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times - Certification of Voting System/applicable Components by December 31, 2019 for use in CA by SOS • Matrix Requirements -Customer Support/Warranty and Maintenance -Application Software and Integration -Hardware and Software Design/System Architecture Approach -Documentation and System Administration -Training		<b>3</b>	
<b>COST OF PROPOSAL - Proposal Price</b>	40	0	0
Proposal demonstrates: -Overall cost will be scored by the Evaluation Committee as a whole and given one score based on an appropriate cost scoring method. -Identify issues for discussion below such as; ongoing costs, pricing detail, etc.		<b>3</b>	





**Individual Evaluator Score Sheet**  
**RFP-031-C022406-KG**  
**Voting Systems**

Attachment C

		0	0
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions:			
• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;		4	
• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to;			
• Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.			
Respondent Total	100		0
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			0