## ATTACHMENT I

Detailed scoring criteria and scores (out of total 100) for each software vendor:

TOTAL SCORE	58.21	76.97	61.51	77.59	59.18	79.02	66.93	51.68	73.75
Small and Micro-Businesses receive     preference (proposer must be certified by     the State of California as a small or micro- business.)	0	0	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
<ol><li>Local Pasadena Business receive 5% preference.</li></ol>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. A willingness to act in the capacity of a Vendor with PWP. 5%	5	5	4	5	2	5	4	4	3
7. Overall cost of Vendor's proposal. 30%	15	22	17	17	30	24	27	17	29
6. Vendor's acceptance of PWP's contractual terms and conditions, if applicable. 5%	0	3	0	3	0	3	3	0	0
<ol> <li>Availability of sufficient high quality Vendor personnel with the required skills and experience for the specific approach proposed. 5%</li> </ol>	3	5	4	5	1	3	1	1	4
The Vendor's stability, experience and record of past performance in delivering such services. 5%	3	4	2	5	1	4	1	1	3
An example of the Vendor's ability to deliver the indicated service in accordance with the specifications set out in this RFP. 5%	2	4	4	5	0	4	1	1	4
The extent to which Vendor's proposed solution fulfills PWP's stated requirements as set out in this RFP. 30%	26	30	27	29	24	28	25	25	27
Completion of all required responses in the correct format. 5%	5	5	4	5	1	5	5	3	4
Evaluation Criteria	Allegro Dallas, TX	OATI Minneapolis, MN	OpenLink Houston, TX	PCI Norman, OK	Pioneer Solutions Denver, CO	Power Settlements Claremont, CA	QuantRisk/SavNergy Fort Lauderdale, FL	Triple Point Westport, CT	Ventyx Atlanta,GA

\*PIONEER SOLUTIONS: Failed to submit an Affidavit of Non-Collusion

\*\*TRIPLE POINT: Submitted an unsigned Affidavit of Non-Collusion

TOP FOUR SCORES