

EVALUATION RUBRIC RESULTS - FINAL VOTE 2-6-19

**EVALUATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: ONE CONTRACT BE AWARDED TO COMPUTERLINK AND ITS 4 SUBCONTRACTORS**

CATEGORY & PART	DESCRIPTION	#1 VENDOR	#2 VENDOR	#3 VENDOR
CAT 1 PART A	LAPTOPS	COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	SESCO
CAT 1 PART B	TABLETS	COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	
CAT 2 PART A & B	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	COMPUTERLINK	SANTILLANA	EVERTEC
CAT 3 PART A	LOGISTICS & DISTRIBUTION	COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	SESCO
CAT 3 PART B	HELP DESK & TICKETING	COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	
CAT 3 PART C	INVENTORY MGMT & TRACKING	COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	

PROPOSALS SUBMITTED ON 10-12-18 IN RESPONSE TO RFP 2018-002

	PRIME CONTRACTOR	SERVICES PROPOSED	PRIME AND SUBCONTRACTORS	PRICING
1	<b>EVERTEC GROUP LLC</b>	Cat 1 - Laptops & Carts (Dell)	<b>Caribbean Data</b>	\$87,901,113.25
		Cat 1 - Tablets & Carts (MS Surface)	<b>Caribbean Data</b>	\$12,082,351.12
		Cat 2 - Professional Development (Gold)	<b>Camera Mundi</b>	\$61,087,034.69
		Cat 3 - Project Management	<b>Evertec</b>	\$19,198,494.02
		Service Total (Does not include quoted cost of Performance Bond) :		<b>\$180,268,993.08</b>
2	<b>COMPUTER NETWORK SYSTEM DBA CORP COMPUTERLINK</b>	Cat 1 - Laptops & Carts (HP)	<b>Computerlink &amp; UDT</b>	\$74,484,210.00
		Cat 1 - Tablets & Carts (Apple)	<b>Computerlink &amp; UDT</b>	\$10,296,000.00
		Cat 2 - Professional Development	<b>Forward Learning</b>	\$30,280,320.00
		Cat 3 - Project Management	<b>Computerlink, HP &amp; Apple</b>	\$10,275,026.50
		Service Total :		<b>\$125,335,556.50</b>
3	<b>SESCO</b>	Cat 1 - 20,000 Laptops & 620 Carts (Acer)	<b>Sesco</b>	\$9,996,900.00
		Cat 3 - Project Management	<b>Sesco</b>	\$199,960.00
				<b>\$10,196,860.00</b>
4	<b>LS INNOVATIVE EDUCATION CTR</b>	Cat 2 - Professional Development	<b>LS Education Center</b>	<b>\$7,805,400.00</b>
5	<b>SM INC.</b>	Cat 2 - Professional Development	<b>SM, Inc.</b>	<b>\$889,300.00</b>
6	<b>EDICIONES SANTILLANA</b>	Cat 2 - Professional Development	<b>Ediciones Santillana</b>	<b>\$18,553,500.00</b>
6	<b>GLOBAL EDUCATION EXCHANGE OPPORTUNITIES</b>	Cat 2 - Professional Development		<b>\$38,068,440.00</b>



**PRDE-OSIATD-2018-002-MOBILE DEVICE, PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT  
PROPOSAL EVALUATION SHEET**

**INSTRUCTIONS: RATE EACH VENDOR BETWEEN 1 TO 10 (10 being highest)**

CATEGORY 2 PART A & B: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - LAPTOPS & TABLETS													
CRITERIA	WEIGHT	COMPUTERLINK		EVERTEC		LS INNOV ED CTR		SANTILLANA		SM INC		GEEO	
		RATING	SCORE	RATING	SCORE	RATING	SCORE	RATING	SCORE	RATING	SCORE	RATING	SCORE
1 Quality and responsiveness of proposed services and/or products, to the specific requirements of the RFP, including minimum device functionality and Service Level Agreements.	30%	8.67	26.0%	8.67	26.0%	5.33	16.0%	8.00	24%	6.33	19.0%	8.67	26.0%
2 Past performance on other contracts of comparable scopes and size with PRDE and/or other school systems, government agencies and/or businesses.	20%	8.33	16.7%	8.20	16.4%	10.00	20.0%	10.00	20%	9.00	18.0%	7.90	15.8%
3 Price of equipment and services.	20%	7.00	14.0%	1.00	2.0%	9.00	18.0%	10.00	20%	0%	0%	6.00	12%
4 Ability of Proposer to deliver proposed equipment and services based on	15%	7.80	11.7%	8.40	12.6%	6.20	9.3%	7.20	11%	8.40	12.6%	7.80	11.7%
5 Comprehensiveness of proposal for delivering all categories of requested equipment and services.	15%		15.0%		15.0%		2.5%		2.5%		2.5%		2.5%
	<b>100%</b>	<b>31.80</b>	<b>83.4%</b>	<b>26.27</b>	<b>72.0%</b>	<b>30.53</b>	<b>65.8%</b>	<b>35.20</b>	<b>77.3%</b>	<b>23.73</b>	<b>52.1%</b>	<b>30.37</b>	<b>68.0%</b>
		<b>1</b>		<b>3</b>		<b>5</b>		<b>2</b>		<b>6</b>		<b>4</b>	

<b>RECOMMENDATION/COMMENTS:</b>
<b>The Committee recommends awarding the contract for these services to Computerlink</b>

excluded, bc pricing is unreasonably low

**BERNICE ECHEVARRIA** 2/6/2019  
NAME & TITLE OF VOTING MEMBER 1 DATE

**JONATHAN GONZALEZ** 2/6/2019  
NAME & TITLE OF VOTING MEMBER 2 DATE

**VICTOR ORTIZ** 2/6/2019  
NAME & TITLE OF VOTING MEMBER 3 DATE

**MARITZA RIVERA** 2/6/2019  
NAME & TITLE OF VOTING MEMBER 4 DATE





CRITERIA #1

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVE
Quality and responsiveness of proposed services and/or products, to the specific requirements of the RFP, including minimum device functionality and Service Level Agreements.	30%	To evaluate the degree to which proposals include all required forms and information, the quality of proposed equipment and/or services, and whether proposed equipment and/or services meet the minimum RFP specifications.

CATEGORY 1 PART A - LAPTOPS & CARTS

				SERVICE CATEGORY #1 PART A - LAPTOPS & CARTS							
ELEMENTS		RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS	COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	LS INNOV ED CTR	SANTILLANA	SESCO	SM INC	GEEO
					RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING
1	PROPOSAL INCLUDES ALL REQUIRED SUBMITTALS	APPEND IV	If Mandatory submittals omitted, vendor is automatically disqualified 1 Point is Deducted for Each Missing Submittal	1 to 10	10 (No Deductions)	10 (No Deductions)			9 (1 Deduction)		
2	DEVICE PROPOSAL FUNCTIONALITY COMPLIANCE CATEGORY 1:PART A - LAPTOPS AND CARTS	FORM 11	Meets all minimum requirements and exceeds more than 50% of Meets all and exceeds some device minimum requirements Meets more than 90% of device minimum requirements Meets between 50-89% of device minimum requirements Meets less than 50% of device minimum requirements	9 to 10 7 to 8 6 2 to 5 1	8	6			6		
3	QUALITY OF SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT		Meets all and greatly exceeds multiple requirements of SLA Meets all and exceeds some minimum SLA requirements Meets more than 90% of minimum SLA requirements Meets between 50-89% of minimum SLA requirements Meets less than 50% of minimum SLA requirements	9 to 10 7 to 8 6 2 to 5 1	8	6			6		
4	QUALITY OF PROPOSAL PLAN AND SCHEDULE		Detailed Plan with estimated dates and contingencies establishing More general description of tasks with a partial timeline Incomplete Plan and or Schedule	7 to 10 3 to 6 1 to 2	9	9			5		
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>					<b>35</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>					<b>8.75</b>	<b>7.75</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>6.50</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

THE AVERAGE OF THE TOTAL POINTS ASSIGNED FOR ELEMENTS 1-4 ABOVE WILL BE DETERMINED FOR EACH CATEGORY/PART BID BY EACH VENDOR (ROUNDED UP)

CRITERIA #1

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVE
Quality and responsiveness of proposed services and/or products, to the specific requirements of the RFP, including minimum device functionality and Service Level Agreements.	30%	To evaluate the degree to which proposals include all required forms and information, the quality of proposed equipment and/or services, and whether proposed equipment and/or services meet the minimum RFP specifications.

CATEGORY 1 PART B - TABLETS & CARTS

					SERVICE CATEGORY #1 PART B - TABLETS & CARTS						
ELEMENTS		RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS	COMPUTERLINK RATING	EVERTEC RATING	LS INNOV ED CTR RATING	SANTILLANA RATING	SESCO SCORE	SM INC SCORE	GEEO SCORE
1	<b>PROPOSAL INCLUDES ALL REQUIRED SUBMITTALS</b>	APPEND IV	If Mandatory submittals omitted, vendor is automatically disqualified 1 Point is Deducted for Each Missing Submittal	1 to 10	10 (No Deductions)	10 (No Deductions)					
2	<b>DEVICE PROPOSAL FUNCTIONALITY COMPLIANCE</b> CATEGORY 1:PART B - TABLETS AND CARTS	FORM 11	Meets all minimum requirements and exceeds more than 50% of device Meets all and exceeds some device minimum requirements Meets more than 90% of device minimum requirements Meets between 50-89% of device minimum requirements Meets less than 50% of device minimum requirements	9 to 10 7 to 8 6 2 to 5 1	6	6					
3	<b>QUALITY OF SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT</b>		Meets all and greatly exceeds multiple requirements of SLA Meets all and exceeds some minimum SLA requirements Meets more than 90% of minimum SLA requirements Meets between 50-89% of minimum SLA requirements Meets less than 50% of minimum SLA requirements	9 to 10 7 to 8 6 2 to 5 1	6	6					
4	<b>QUALITY OF PROPOSAL PLAN AND SCHEDULE</b>		Detailed Plan with estimated dates and contingencies establishing ability to More general description of tasks with a partial timeline Incomplete Plan and or Schedule	7 to 10 3 to 6 1 to 2	9	9					
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>					<b>31</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>					<b>7.75</b>	<b>7.75</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

THE AVERAGE OF THE TOTAL POINTS ASSIGNED FOR ELEMENTS 1-4 ABOVE WILL BE DETERMINED FOR EACH CATEGORY/PART BID BY EACH VENDOR (ROUNDED UP)

CRITERIA #1

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVE
Quality and responsiveness of proposed services and/or products, to the specific requirements of the RFP, including minimum device functionality and Service Level Agreements.	30%	To evaluate the degree to which proposals include all required forms and information, the quality of proposed equipment and/or services, and whether proposed equipment and/or services meet the minimum RFP specifications.

CATEGORY 2 PART A & B - LAPTOPS (Grades 3-12) AND TABLET (K-2)

					SERVICE CATEGORY #2 PART A - PD, CURRICULUM INTEGRATION & TECH TRAINING - LAPTOPS						
ELEMENTS		RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS	COMPUTERLINK RATING	EVERTEC RATING	LS INNOV ED CTR RATING	SANTILLANA RATING	SESCO SCORE	SM INC SCORE	GEEO SCORE
1	PROPOSAL INCLUDES ALL REQUIRED SUBMITTALS	APPENDIX IV	If Mandatory submittals omitted, vendor is automatically disqualified 1 Point is Deducted for Each Missing Submittal	1 to 10	10 (No Deductions)	10 (No Deductions)	8 (2 Deductions)	9 (1 Deduction)		8 (2 Deductions)	7 (3 Deductions)
2	QUALITY OF PROPOSED SERVICES	<p>Note: Elements revised by PD reviewers on 12/29/18 to eliminate SLA focus and add elements better aligned to these services</p>	Meets all and greatly exceeds multiple requirements of the needs assessment and education training proposal	9 to 10							10
			Meets all and exceeds some minimum of the needs assessment and education training proposal	7 to 8	8	8		7			
			Meets more than 90% of minimum of the needs assessment and education training proposal	6							
			Meets between 50-89% of minimum of the needs assessment and education training proposal	2 to 5						4	
			Meets less than 50% of minimum of the needs assessment and education training proposal	1			1				
3	QUALITY OF PROPOSAL PLAN AND SCHEDULE		Detailed Plan, with estimated dates and contingencies establishing ability to More general description of tasks with a partial timeline Incomplete Plan and or Schedule	7 to 10 3 to 6 1 to 2	8	8	7	8		7	9
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>					<b>26</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>					<b>8.67</b>	<b>8.67</b>	<b>5.33</b>	<b>8.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>6.33</b>	<b>8.67</b>

THE AVERAGE OF THE TOTAL POINTS ASSIGNED FOR ELEMENTS 1-3 ABOVE WILL BE DETERMINED FOR EACH CATEGORY/PART BID BY EACH VENDOR (ROUNDED UP)



NOTES ON PROPOSER POINT RATING

COMPUTERLINK	ComputerLink presented a proposal that highlights blended learning and project-based learning. But, those topics are covered on Year 2, which will delay our goal of improving academic performance.
EVERTEC	Evertec presented a realistic proposal that addresses: the lack of instructors to train 30,000 teachers, technical difficulties in schools, mentoring needs of teachers. There is no breakdown of the costs.
LS INNOV ED CTR	LS proposed a professional development that looks too product-specific for just a couple of regions. We expect teachers to have a deeper understanding of curriculum integration. They don't provide a timeline.
SANTILLANA	Compliance monitoring department
SESCO	Sesco did not present a PD proposal.
SM INC	SM presents a consultative approach to this project and a well structured set of activities to achieve their goals. The problem is they didn't propose activities for Years 2 and 3, or indications of what they would do to an extent the Committee feels comfortable with.
GEEO	The company presents a formal methodology to assess teachers, rank and prepare an individualized plan. They did not provide enough information that would allow us to determine whether they had the ability to manage a large scale project, from the project management and organizational standpoints.

CRITERIA #1

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVE
Quality and responsiveness of proposed services and/or products, to the specific requirements of the RFP, including minimum device functionality and Service Level Agreements.	30%	To evaluate the degree to which proposals include all required forms and information, the quality of proposed equipment and/or services, and whether proposed equipment and/or services meet the minimum RFP specifications.

CATEGORY 3 PART A - DEPLOYMENT & INITIAL DISTRIBUTION

					SERVICE CATEGORY #3 PART A - LOGISTICS AND INITIAL DISTRIBUTION						
ELEMENTS		RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS	COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	LS INNOV ED CTR	SANTILLANA	SESCO	SM INC	GEEO
					RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	SCORE	SCORE	SCORE
1	PROPOSAL INCLUDES ALL REQUIRED SUBMITTALS	APPENDIX IV If Mandatory submittals omitted, vendor is automatically disqualified 1 Point is Deducted for Each Missing Submittal		1 to 10	10 (No Deductions)	10 (No Deductions)			9 (1 Deduction)		
2	QUALITY OF PROPOSED SERVICES & PRODUCTS			9 to 10 7 to 8 6 2 to 5 1		8			8		
3	QUALITY OF PROPOSAL PLAN AND SCHEDULE			7 to 10 3 to 6 1 to 2	7	9			8		
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>					<b>23</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>					<b>7.67</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>8.33</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

THE AVERAGE OF THE TOTAL POINTS ASSIGNED FOR ELEMENTS 1-3 ABOVE WILL BE DETERMINED FOR EACH CATEGORY/PART BID BY EACH VENDOR (ROUNDED UP)

**CRITERIA #1**

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVE
Quality and responsiveness of proposed services and/or products, to the specific requirements of the RFP, including minimum device functionality and Service Level Agreements.	30%	To evaluate the degree to which proposals include all required forms and information, the quality of proposed equipment and/or services, and whether proposed equipment and/or services meet the minimum RFP specifications.

**CATEGORY 3 PART B - TECH SUPPORT, HELP DESK AND TICKETING**

					SERVICE CATEGORY #3 PART B - TECH SUPPORT, HELP DESK AND TICKETING						
ELEMENTS		RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS	COMPUTERLINK RATING	EVERTEC RATING	LS INNOV ED CTR RATING	SANTILLANA RATING	SESCO SCORE	SM INC SCORE	GEO SCORE
1	PROPOSAL INCLUDES ALL REQUIRED SUBMITTALS	APPENDIX IV	If Mandatory submittals omitted, vendor is automatically disqualified 1 Point is Deducted for Each Missing Submittal	1 to 10	10 (No Deductions)	10 (No Deductions)					
2	QUALITY OF PROPOSED SERVICES & PRODUCTS		Meets all and greatly exceeds multiple requirements of SLA Meets all and exceeds some minimum SLA requirements Meets more than 90% of minimum SLA requirements Meets between 50-89% of minimum SLA requirements Meets less than 50% of minimum SLA requirements	9 to 10 7 to 8 6 2 to 5 1		8					
3	QUALITY OF PROPOSAL PLAN AND SCHEDULE		Detailed Plan, with estimated dates and contingencies establishing ability to More general description of tasks with a partial timeline Incomplete Plan and or Schedule	7 to 10 3 to 6 1 to 2	7	9					
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>					<b>23</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>					<b>7.67</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

**THE AVERAGE OF THE TOTAL POINTS ASSIGNED FOR ELEMENTS 1-3 ABOVE WILL BE DETERMINED FOR EACH CATEGORY/PART BID BY EACH VENDOR (ROUNDED UP)**

CRITERIA #1

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVE
Quality and responsiveness of proposed services and/or products, to the specific requirements of the RFP, including minimum device functionality and Service Level Agreements.	30%	To evaluate the degree to which proposals include all required forms and information, the quality of proposed equipment and/or services, and whether proposed equipment and/or services meet the minimum RFP specifications.

CATEGORY 3 PART C: ASSET INVENTORY MANAGEMENT & DEVICE TRACKING

					SERVICE CATEGORY #3 PART C: ASSET INVENTORY MANAGEMENT & DEVICE TRACKING						
ELEMENTS		RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS	COMPUTERLINK RATING	EVERTEC RATING	LS INNOV ED CTR RATING	SANTILLANA RATING	SESCO SCORE	SM INC SCORE	GEOO SCORE
1	PROPOSAL INCLUDES ALL REQUIRED SUBMITTALS	APPENDIX IV If Mandatory submittals omitted, vendor is automatically disqualified 1 Point is Deducted for Each Missing Submittal		1 to 10	10 (No Deductions)	10 (No Deductions)					
2	QUALITY OF PROPOSED SERVICES & PRODUCTS	Meets all and greatly exceeds multiple requirements of SLA Meets all and exceeds some minimum SLA requirements Meets more than 90% of minimum SLA requirements Meets between 50-89% of minimum SLA requirements Meets less than 50% of minimum SLA requirements		9 to 10 7 to 8 6 2 to 5 1	8	8					
3	QUALITY OF PROPOSAL PLAN AND SCHEDULE	Detailed Plan, with estimated dates and contingencies establishing ability to More general description of tasks with a partial timeline Incomplete Plan and or Schedule		7 to 10 3 to 6 1 to 2	9	9					
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>					<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>					<b>9.00</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

THE AVERAGE OF THE TOTAL POINTS ASSIGNED FOR ELEMENTS 1-3 ABOVE WILL BE DETERMINED FOR EACH CATEGORY/PART BID BY EACH VENDOR (ROUNDED UP)



NOTES ON PROPOSER POINT RATING

COMPUTERLINK	Experience Listed: \$12M - Cat 1; \$150M - Cat 1, 2 & 3; \$100M - Cat 1 & 3; \$3M - Cat 1; \$2.2M - Cat 1; \$2.0M - Cat 1; \$10-\$12M/yr - Cat 1 & 3
EVERTEC	Experience Listed: \$5M/yr - Cat 3; \$4M/yr - Cat 3; \$100M - Cat 3, Camera Mundi list - Cat 2 Services & contract amounts undisclosed (most recent contract ended in 2016); Caribbean Data list - Services & contract amounts undisclosed (most recent contract ended in 2009)
LS INNOV ED CTR	\$385K-Cat 2; \$5.2M -- Cat 2; \$1.5M - Cat 2; \$1.9M - Cat 2
SANTILLANA	\$2M - Cat 2; \$19M - Cat 2; \$161K - Cat 2; \$52M - Cat 2; \$8.2 - Cat 2; Amount Undisclosed - Cat 2
SESCO	\$7M - Cat 1 & 3; \$362K - Cat 1 & 3; \$1.32M - Cat 1 & 3; \$640K - Cat 1 & 3; \$4.5M - Cat 1 & 3; Over \$9M - Cat 1 & 3
SM INC	\$50-\$200 - Cat 2; \$5M - Cat 2; \$50-\$200 - Cat 2
GEE0	\$3.7 - Cat 2; Amount Undisclosed - Cat 2; \$8.3M - Cat 2; Amount Undisclose - Cat 2

CRITERIA #2

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVE
Past performance on other contracts of comparable scopes and size with PRDE and/or other school systems, government agencies and/or businesses.	20%	To assess experience delivering proposed services and equipment, based on evaluation of current and/or prior customers, and the number of similar projects

					SERVICE CATEGORY #2 - PD, CURRICULUM INTEGRATION & TECH TRAINING						
					COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	LS INNOV ED CTR	SANTILLANA	SESCO	SM INC	GEEQ
					RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	SCORE	SCORE	SCORE
ELEMENTS	RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS								
1	3 REFERENCES (Minimum)	APPENDIX IV Average rating by highest rated 3 references	1 to 10		10	9.6	10	10		10	9.7
2	OTHER COMPARABLE PROJECTS - SCALE	At least 1 project of larger scale (20%+), or multiple projects that together equal or exceed proposed scale	8 to 10		10	10	10	10		10	4
		At least 1 project of comparable scale or multiple concurrent projects that together equal proposed scale	5 to 7								
		At least 1 project that is partially comparable in scale or multiple concurrent projects that together are partially comparable in scale	2 to 4								
		No comparable projects	1								
3	OTHER COMPARABLE PROJECTS - SCOPE	More than 1 project that meets or exceeds scope	8 to 10		5	5	10	10		7	10
		1 project of comparable scope	5 to 7								
		At least 1 project that is partially comparable in scope	2 to 4								
		No comparable scope projects	1								
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>					<b>25</b>	<b>24.6</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>23.7</b>
<b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>					<b>8.33</b>	<b>8.20</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>7.90</b>

**THE AVERAGE OF THE TOTAL POINTS ASSIGNED FOR ELEMENTS 1-3 ABOVE WILL BE DETERMINED FOR EACH CATEGORY/PART BID BY EACH VENDOR (ROUNDED UP)**

NOTES ON PROPOSER POINT RATING

COMPUTERLINK	Experience Listed: \$12M - Cat 1; \$150M - Cat 1, 2 & 3; \$100M - Cat 1 & 3; \$3M - Cat 1; \$2.2M - Cat 1; \$2.0M - Cat 1; \$10-\$12M/yr - Cat 1 & 3
EVERTEC	Experience Listed: \$5M/yr - Cat 3; \$4M/yr - Cat 3; \$100M - Cat 3, Camera Mundi list - Cat 2 Services & contract amounts undisclosed (most recent contract ended in 2016); Caribbean Data list - Services & contract amounts undisclosed (most recent contract ended in 2009)
LS INNOV ED CTR	\$385K-Cat 2; \$5.2M -- Cat 2; \$1.5M - Cat 2; \$1.9M - Cat 2
SANTILLANA	\$2M - Cat 2; \$19M - Cat 2; \$161K - Cat 2; \$52M - Cat 2; \$8.2 - Cat 2; Amount Undisclosed - Cat 2
SESCO	\$7M - Cat 1 & 3; \$362K - Cat 1 & 3; \$1.32M - Cat 1 & 3; \$640K - Cat 1 & 3; \$4.5M - Cat 1 & 3; Over \$9M - Cat 1 & 3
SM INC	\$50-\$200 - Cat 2; \$5M - Cat 2; \$50-\$200 - Cat 2
GEE0	\$3.7 - Cat 2; Amount Undisclosed - Cat 2; \$8.3M - Cat 2; Amount Undisclose - Cat 2



CRITERIA #2

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVE
Past performance on other contracts of comparable scopes and size with PRDE and/or other school systems, government agencies and/or businesses.	20%	To assess experience delivering proposed services and equipment, based on evaluation of current and/or prior customers, and the number of similar projects

				SERVICE CATEGORY #3 - PM, HELP DESK, ASSET INVENTORY MGMT & TRACKING							
ELEMENTS		RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS	COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	LS INNOV ED CTR	SANTILLANA	SESCO	SM INC	GEEO
					RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	SCORE	SCORE	SCORE
1	3 REFERENCES (Minimum)	APPENDIX IV	Average rating by highest rated 3 references	1 to 10	10	9.6			10		
2	OTHER COMPARABLE PROJECTS - SCALE		At least 1 project of larger scale (20%+), or multiple projects that together equal or exceed proposed scale	8 to 10	10	10			10		
			At least 1 project of comparable scale or multiple concurrent projects that together equal proposed scale	5 to 7							
			At least 1 project that is partially comparable in scale or multiple concurrent projects that together are partially comparable in scale	2 to 4							
			No comparable projects	1							
3	OTHER COMPARABLE PROJECTS - SCOPE		More than 1 project that meets or exceeds scope	8 to 10	10	10			10		
			1 project of comparable scope	5 to 7							
			At least 1 project that is partially comparable in scope	2 to 4							
			No comparable scope projects	1							
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>					<b>30</b>	<b>29.6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>					<b>10.00</b>	<b>9.87</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

**THE AVERAGE OF THE TOTAL POINTS ASSIGNED FOR ELEMENTS 1-3 ABOVE WILL BE DETERMINED FOR EACH CATEGORY/PART BID BY EACH VENDOR (ROUNDED UP)**

NOTES ON PROPOSER POINT RATING

COMPUTERLINK	Experience Listed: \$12M - Cat 1; \$150M - Cat 1, 2 & 3; \$100M - Cat 1 & 3; \$3M - Cat 1; \$2.2M - Cat 1; \$2.0M - Cat 1; \$10-\$12M/yr - Cat 1 & 3
EVERTEC	Experience Listed: \$5M/yr - Cat 3; \$4M/yr - Cat 3; \$100M - Cat 3, Camera Mundi list - Cat 2 Services & contract amounts undisclosed (most recent contract ended in 2016); Caribbean Data list - Services & contract amounts undisclosed (most recent contract ended in 2009)
LS INNOV ED CTR	\$385K-Cat 2; \$5.2M -- Cat 2; \$1.5M - Cat 2; \$1.9M - Cat 2
SANTILLANA	\$2M - Cat 2; \$19M - Cat 2; \$161K - Cat 2; \$52M - Cat 2; \$8.2 - Cat 2; Amount Undisclosed - Cat 2
SESCO	\$7M - Cat 1 & 3; \$362K - Cat 1 & 3; \$1.32M - Cat 1 & 3; \$640K - Cat 1 & 3; \$4.5M - Cat 1 & 3; Over \$9M - Cat 1 & 3
SM INC	\$50-\$200 - Cat 2; \$5M - Cat 2; \$50-\$200 - Cat 2
GEE0	\$3.7 - Cat 2; Amount Undisclosed - Cat 2; \$8.3M - Cat 2; Amount Undisclose - Cat 2

CRITERIA #3

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVE
Price of equipment and services.*	20%	To Rate/Rank Proposals on Pricing
*If applicable, the percentage established by Resolution of the Board for the Investment in the Puerto Rican Industry <b>shall be identified by Proposer in a separate column in the Proposer's price proposal</b> so that the evaluation of pricing to be conducted in accordance with Law No. 14 of January 8, 2004, as amended.		

CATEGORY 1 PART A - LAPTOPS & CARTS

SERVICE CATEGORY #1 PART A - LAPTOPS & CARTS						
COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	LS INNOV ED CTR	SANTILLANA	SESCO	SM INC	GEEO
RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	SCORE	SCORE	SCORE
				10		
9	9					
9	9	0	0	10	0	0

ELEMENTS	RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS
1 PRICING FOR EQUIPMENT OR SERVICE	FORM 2	Lowest Price	10
		Pricing within 30% of Lowest Price	9
		Pricing within 30-60% of Lowest Price	8
		Pricing within 60-90% of Lowest Price	7
		Pricing within 90-120% of Lowest Price	6
		Pricing within 120-150% of Lowest Price	5
		Pricing within 150-180% of Lowest Price	4
		Pricing within 180-210% of Lowest Price	3
		Pricing within 210-240% of Lowest Price	2
		Pricing 240% or higher than Lowest Pricing	1

CRITERIA #3

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVE
Price of equipment and services.*	20%	To Rate/Rank Proposals on Pricing
*If applicable, the percentage established by Resolution of the Board for the Investment in the Puerto Rican Industry <b>shall be identified by Proposer in a separate column in the Proposer's price proposal</b> so that the evaluation of pricing to be conducted in accordance with Law No. 14 of January 8, 2004, as amended.		

CATEGORY 1 PART B - TABLETS & CARTS

SERVICE CATEGORY #1 PART B - TABLETS & CARTS

ELEMENTS	RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS	COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	LS INNOV ED CTR	SANTILLANA	SESCO	SM INC	GEO
				RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	SCORE	SCORE	SCORE
1 PRICING FOR EQUIPMENT OR SERVICE	FORM 2	Lowest Price	10	10						
		Pricing within 30% of Lowest Price	9		9					
		Pricing within 30-60% of Lowest Price	8							
		Pricing within 60-90% of Lowest Price	7							
		Pricing within 90-120% of Lowest Price	6							
		Pricing within 120-150% of Lowest Price	5							
		Pricing within 150-180% of Lowest Price	4							
		Pricing within 180-210% of Lowest Price	3							
		Pricing within 210-240% of Lowest Price	2							
		Pricing 240% or higher than Lowest Pricing	1							
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>				<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

CRITERIA #3

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVE
Price of equipment and services.*	20%	To Rate/Rank Proposals on Pricing
*If applicable, the percentage established by Resolution of the Board for the Investment in the Puerto Rican Industry <b>shall be identified by Proposer in a separate column in the Proposer's price proposal</b> so that the evaluation of pricing to be conducted in accordance with Law No. 14 of January 8, 2004, as amended.		

CATEGORY 2 PART A - LAPTOPS (Grades 3-12) & CARTS

SERVICE CATEGORY #2 PART A - LAPTOPS (GRADES 3-12) & CARTS										
	COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	LS INNOV ED CTR	SANTILLANA	SESCO	SM INC	GEE0			
ELEMENTS	RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	SCORE	SCORE	SCORE
1 PRICING FOR EQUIPMENT OR SERVICE	FORM 2	Lowest Price	10				10			
		Pricing within 30% of Lowest Price	9			9				
		Pricing within 30-60% of Lowest Price	8							
		Pricing within 60-90% of Lowest Price	7	7						
		Pricing within 90-120% of Lowest Price	6							6
		Pricing within 120-150% of Lowest Price	5							
		Pricing within 150-180% of Lowest Price	4							
		Pricing within 180-210% of Lowest Price	3							
		Pricing within 210-240% of Lowest Price	2							
		Pricing 240% or higher than Lowest Pricing	1		1					
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>				<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>

NOTES ON PROPOSER POINT RATING

COMPUTERLINK	Laptop and Tablet PD \$30,280,320.00 for approximately 30,000 individuals a year
EVERTEC	Laptop and Tablet PD \$40,926,803.36 for approximately 30,000 individuals a year

<p>LS INNOV ED CTR</p>	<p>Laptop PD \$5,854,050.00 for approximately 11,000 individuals a year  Tablet PD \$ 1,951,350.00 for approximately 11,000 individuals a year</p> <p>Since the vendor proposed for less than the 30,000 individuals to be trained each year, the Evaluation Committee calculated estimated vendor pricing for 30,000 <b>SOLELY</b> to permit apple to apple comparison between all vendors. Based on the expanded pricing, the vendor's pricing for evaluation purposes is as follows:  Laptop PD \$15,965,590.91 for approximately 30,000 individuals a year  Tablet PD \$ 5,321,863.64 for approximately 30,000 individuals a year</p>
<p>SANTILLANA</p>	<p>Laptop PD \$16,048,777.000 for approximately 31,000 individuals a year  Tablet PD \$2,504,722.00 for approximately 5,000 individuals a year</p>
<p>SESCO</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>
<p>SM INC</p>	<p>Laptop PD \$444,650.00 for approximately 500-720 individuals a year  Tablet PD \$444,650.00 for approximately 500-720 individuals a year</p> <p>The Evaluation Committee determined that the number of individuals to be trained each year was so far below the required training requested, that it would not be possible to compare the other vendor pricing for a representative portion of the training population against SM Inc.'s pricing. As result, the Committee voted to give SM the lowest score for pricing.</p> <p>"</p>
<p>GEE0</p>	<p>Laptop PD for approximately 27,000 teachers - \$17,817,840.00  Tablet PD for approximately 27,000 teachers - \$17,817,840.00</p>

CRITERIA #3

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVE
Price of equipment and services.*	20%	To Rate/Rank Proposals on Pricing
*If applicable, the percentage established by Resolution of the Board for the Investment in the Puerto Rican Industry <b>shall be identified by Proposer in a separate column in the Proposer's price proposal</b> so that the evaluation of pricing to be conducted in accordance with Law No. 14 of January 8, 2004, as amended.		

CATEGORY 3 PART A - LOGISTICS & INITIAL DISTRIBUTION

SERVICE CATEGORY #3 PART A - LOGISTICS & INITIAL DISTRIBUTION						
COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	LS INNOV ED CTR	SANTILLANA	SESCO	SM INC	GEO
RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	SCORE	SCORE	SCORE
10				7		
	2					
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>

ELEMENTS	RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS
1 PRICING FOR EQUIPMENT OR SERVICE	FORM 2	Lowest Price	10
		Pricing within 30% of Lowest Price	9
		Pricing within 30-60% of Lowest Price	8
		Pricing within 60-90% of Lowest Price	7
		Pricing within 90-120% of Lowest Price	6
		Pricing within 120-150% of Lowest Price	5
		Pricing within 150-180% of Lowest Price	4
		Pricing within 180-210% of Lowest Price	3
		Pricing within 210-240% of Lowest Price	2
		Pricing 240% or higher than Lowest Pricing	1





CRITERIA #3

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVE
Price of equipment and services.*	20%	To Rate/Rank Proposals on Pricing
*If applicable, the percentage established by Resolution of the Board for the Investment in the Puerto Rican Industry <b>shall be identified by Proposer in a separate column in the Proposer's price proposal</b> so that the evaluation of pricing to be conducted in accordance with Law No. 14 of January 8, 2004, as amended.		

CATEGORY 3 PART C - ASSET INVENTORY MGMT & DEVICE TRACKING

SERVICE CATEGORY #3 PART C - ASSET INVENTORY MGMT & DEVICE TRACKING						
COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	LS INNOV ED CTR	SANTILLANA	SESCO	SM INC	GEO
RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	SCORE	SCORE	SCORE
10	8	0	0	0	0	0
10	8	0	0	0	0	0

ELEMENTS	RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS
1 PRICING FOR EQUIPMENT OR SERVICE	FORM 2	Lowest Price	10
		Pricing within 30% of Lowest Price	9
		Pricing within 30-60% of Lowest Price	8
		Pricing within 60-90% of Lowest Price	7
		Pricing within 90-120% of Lowest Price	6
		Pricing within 120-150% of Lowest Price	5
		Pricing within 150-180% of Lowest Price	4
		Pricing within 180-210% of Lowest Price	3
		Pricing within 210-240% of Lowest Price	2
		Pricing 240% or higher than Lowest Pricing	1

10                      8                      0                      0                      0                      0                      0

CRITERIA #4

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHT	OBJECTIVE
Ability of Proposer to deliver proposed equipment and services based on years of experience in the Proposer's industry and economic capacity and stability.	15%	To Rate/Rank Proposals on Proposer's financial ability to deliver under contract

					SERVICE CATEGORY #1 - MOBILE DEVICES & CARTS						
					COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	LS INNOV ED CTR	SANTILLANA	SESCO	SM INC	GEEO
ELEMENTS	RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS		RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	SCORE	SCORE
1 PROPOSER QUESTIONNAIRE - YEARS IN BUSINESS	FORM 4	10 or more years of experience	10		10	10			10		
		7 to 10 years of experience	7 to 9								
		4-6 years of experience	4 to 6								
		2-3 years of experience	2 to 3								
		1 or less years of experience	1								
2 AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (3 YEARS) - Cash flow		Cash flow positive for last 3 years	10								
		Cash flow positive for last 2 years	8	8							
		Cash flow positive for last year	5								
		Cash flow positive for at least one of the past 3 years	2	2					2		
		Not cash flow positive in any year of the last 3 years	0								
3 AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (3 YEARS) - Auditor's opinions		Unqualified audit opinion for last 3 years	10	10	10				10		
		Qualified audit opinion for any one of 3 most recent years	5								
		Adverse audit opinion	0								
4 SIZE OF CONTRACT MEASURED AGAINST COMPANY REVENUE		Contract does not exceed 15% of companies total yearly revenue (highest of last 3 years)	10								
		Contract does not exceed 30% of companies total yearly revenue (highest of last 3 years)	7 to 9		9						
		Contract does not exceed 60% of companies total yearly revenue (highest of last 3 years)	4 to 6								
		Contract does not exceed 100% of companies total yearly revenue (highest of last 3 years)	2 to 3								
		Contract exceeds more than 100% of companies total yearly revenue (highest of last 3 years)	1	1					1		

					SERVICE CATEGORY #1 - MOBILE DEVICES & CARTS					
ELEMENTS	RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS	COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	LS INNOV ED CTR	SANTILLANA	SESCO	SM INC	GEEO
				RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING
5 LEGAL ACTIONS (Potential Threats/Judgment) in Past 3 years	No actions with potential adverse financial impact		10	10	10			10		
	No material actions and 1-2 Minor adverse judgments		7 to 9	(None Reported)	(None Reported)			(None Reported)		
	Legal actions posing some degree of risk of possible liability with financial impact		4 to 6							
	Recent, pending or threatened legal actions with serious adverse financial impact		1 to 3							
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>				<b>39</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>				<b>7.8</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**THE AVERAGE OF THE TOTAL POINTS ASSIGNED FOR ELEMENTS 1-5 ABOVE WILL BE DETERMINED FOR EACH CATEGORY/PART BID BY EACH VENDOR (ROUNDED UP)**

NOTES ON PROPOSER POINT RATING

		Proposal:	Highest revenue last three years:	% of revenues	Cash flow results (Dollar amounts in thousands):
COMPUTERLINK	30 Years in Business	Category I: \$ 83,243,935.00 Category II: \$ 30,280,320.00 Category III: \$ 10,275,026.00	\$ 9,886,406.00	842% 306% 104%	2017: \$70,402 - Positive 2016: \$529,146 - Positive 2015: (\$521,889) - Negative
EVERTEC	14 Years in Business	Category I: \$ 101,983,134 Category II: \$ 41,745,339 Category III: \$ 19,582,463	\$ 407,144,000	25% 10% 5%	2017: (\$1,497) - Negative 2016: \$23,173 - Positive 2015: (\$3,367) - Negative
LS INNOV ED CTR	10 Years in Business	Category II: \$ 7,805,400	\$ 2,912,000	268%	2017: (\$2,553) - Negative 2016: (\$387,642) - Negative 2015: (\$207,756) - Negative

SANTILLANA	27 Years in Business	Category II: \$ 18,553,500.00 \$ 12,472,603.00	149%	2017: \$342,878 - Positive 2016: (\$3,532,779) - Negative 2015: \$55,530 - Positive
SESCO	21 Years in Business ; The entity provided reviewed financial statements without material modifications. The entity is not required to prepare audited financial statements, since volume of business is less than \$3 million for last three years.	Category I: \$ 9,996,900 \$ 2,801,182 Category III: \$ 199,960	357%	2017: (\$94,885) - Negative 2016: \$137,689 - Positive 2015: (\$20,338) - Negative
SM INC	14 Years in Business	Category II: \$ 889,300 \$ 12,928,278	7%	2017: (\$257,540) - Negative 2016: \$2,767,238 - Positive 2015: (\$1,259,367) - Negative
GEEO	10 Years in Business	Category II: \$ 38,068,440 \$ 2,149,827	1771%	2017: \$509,070 - Positive 2016: \$101,577 - Positive 2015: (\$1,575,988) - Negative

CRITERIA #4

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVE
Ability of Proposer to deliver proposed equipment and services based on years of experience in the Proposer's industry and economic capacity and stability.	15%	To Rate/Rank Proposals on Proposer's financial ability to deliver under contract

					SERVICE CATEGORY #2 - PD, CURRICULUM INTEGRATION & TECH TRAINING						
					COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	LS INNOV ED CTR	SANTILLANA	SESCO	SM INC	GEOO
					RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING
ELEMENTS	RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS								
1 PROPOSER QUESTIONNAIRE - YEARS IN BUSINESS	FORM 4	10 or more years of experience	10		10	10	10	10		10	10
		7 to 10 years of experience	7 to 9								
		4-6 years of experience	4 to 6								
		2-3 years of experience	2 to 3								
		1 or less years of experience	1								
2 AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (3 YEARS) - Cash flow		Cash flow positive for last 3 years	10								
		Cash flow positive for last 2 years	8	8							8
		Cash flow positive for last year	5			5					
		Cash flow positive for at least one of the past 3 years	2		2					2	
		Not cash flow positive in any year of the last 3 years	0		0						
3 AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (3 YEARS) - Auditor's opinions		Unqualified audit opinion for last 3 years	10		10	10	10	10		10	10
		Qualified audit opinion for any one of 3 most recent years	5								
		Adverse audit opinion	0								
4 SIZE OF CONTRACT MEASURED AGAINST COMPANY REVENUE		Contract does not exceed 15% of companies total yearly revenue (highest of last 3 years)	10			10				10	
		Contract does not exceed 30% of companies total yearly revenue (highest of last 3 years)	7 to 9								
		Contract does not exceed 60% of companies total yearly revenue (highest of last 3 years)	4 to 6								
		Contract does not exceed 100% of companies total yearly revenue (highest of last 3 years)	2 to 3								
		Contract exceeds more than 100% of companies total yearly revenue (highest of last 3 years)	1		1		1		1		

					SERVICE CATEGORY #2 - PD, CURRICULUM INTEGRATION & TECH TRAINING					
ELEMENTS	RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS	COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	LS INNOV ED CTR	SANTILLANA	SESCO	SM INC	GEOO
				RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING
5 LEGAL ACTIONS (Potential Threats/Judgment) in Past 3 years	No actions with potential adverse financial impact		10	10	10	10	10		10	10
	No material actions and 1-2 Minor adverse judgments		7 to 9	(None Reported)	(None Reported)	(None Reported)	(None Reported)		(None Reported)	(1 Reported - Dismissed in 2015)
	Legal actions posing some degree of risk of possible liability with financial impact		4 to 6							
	Recent, pending or threatened legal actions with serious adverse financial impact		1 to 3							
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>				<b>39</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>				<b>7.8</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>7.8</b>

**THE AVERAGE OF THE TOTAL POINTS ASSIGNED FOR ELEMENTS 1-5 ABOVE WILL BE DETERMINED FOR EACH CATEGORY/PART BID BY EACH VENDOR (ROUNDED UP)**

NOTES ON PROPOSER POINT RATING

		Proposal:	Highest revenue last three years:	% of revenues	Cash flow results (Dollar amounts in thousands):
COMPUTERLINK	30 Years in Business	Category I: \$ 83,243,935.00 Category II: \$ 30,280,320.00 Category III: \$ 10,275,026.00	\$ 9,886,406.00	842% 306% 104%	2017: \$70,402 - Positive 2016: \$529,146 - Positive 2015: (\$521,889) - Negative
EVERTEC	14 Years in Business	Category I: \$ 101,983,134 Category II: \$ 41,745,339 Category III: \$ 19,582,463	\$ 407,144,000	25% 10% 5%	2017: (\$1,497) - Negative 2016: \$23,173 - Positive 2015: (\$3,367) - Negative
LS INNOV ED CTR	10 Years in Business	Category II: \$ 7,805,400	\$ 2,912,000	268%	2017: (\$2,553) - Negative 2016: (\$387,642) - Negative 2015: (\$207,756) - Negative
SANTILLANA	27 Years in Business	Category II: \$ 18,553,500.00	\$ 12,472,603.00	149%	2017: \$342,878 - Positive 2016: (\$3,532,779) - Negative 2015: \$55,530 - Positive
SESCO	21 Years in Business ; The entity provided reviewed financial statements without material modifications. The entity is not required to prepare audited financial statements, since volume of business is less than \$3 million for last three years.	Category I: \$ 9,996,900 Category III: \$ 199,960	\$ 2,801,182	357% 7%	2017: (\$94,885) - Negative 2016: \$137,689 - Positive 2015: (\$20,338) - Negative

SM INC	14 Years in Business	Category II: \$ 889,300 \$ 12,928,278	7% 2017: (\$257,540) - Negative 2016: \$2,767,238 - Positive 2015: (\$1,259,367) - Negative
GEE0	10 Years in Business	Category II: \$ 38,068,440 \$ 2,149,827	1771% 2017: \$509,070 - Positive 2016: \$101,577 - Positive 2015: (\$1,575,988) - Negative



CRITERIA #4

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVE
Ability of Proposer to deliver proposed equipment and services based on years of experience in the Proposer's industry and economic capacity and stability.	15%	To Rate/Rank Proposals on Proposer's financial ability to deliver under contract

SERVICE CATEGORY #3 - PM, HELP DESK ASSET INVENTORY MGMT & TRACKING										
ELEMENTS	RFP FORM	RATING	POINTS	COMPUTERLINK	EVERTEC	LS INNOV ED CTR	SANTILLANA	SESCO	SM INC	GEOO
				RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING	RATING
<b>1 PROPOSER QUESTIONNAIRE - YEARS IN BUSINESS</b>	FORM 4	10 or more years of experience	10	10	10			10		
		7 to 10 years of experience	7 to 9							
		4-6 years of experience	4 to 6							
		2-3 years of experience	2 to 3							
		1 or less years of experience	1							
<b>2 AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (3 YEARS) - Cash flow</b>		Cash flow positive for last 3 years	10							
		Cash flow positive for last 2 years	8	8						
		Cash flow positive for last year	5							
		Cash flow positive for at least one of the past 3 years	2			2		2		
		Not cash flow positive in any year of the last 3 years	0							
<b>3 AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (3 YEARS) - Auditor's opinions</b>		Unqualified audit opinion for last 3 years	10	10	10			10		
		Qualified audit opinion for any one of 3 most recent years	5							
		Adverse audit opinion	0							
<b>4 SIZE OF CONTRACT MEASURED AGAINST COMPANY REVENUE</b>		Contract does not exceed 15% of companies total yearly revenue (highest of last 3 years)	10		10			10		
		Contract does not exceed 30% of companies total yearly revenue (highest of last 3 years)	7 to 9							
		Contract does not exceed 60% of companies total yearly revenue (highest of last 3 years)	4 to 6							
		Contract does not exceed 100% of companies total yearly revenue (highest of last 3 years)	2 to 3							
		Contract exceeds more than 100% of companies total yearly revenue (highest of last 3 years)	1		1					

					<b>SERVICE CATEGORY #3 - PM, ASSET INVENTORY MGMT &amp; TRACKING</b>						
					<b>COMPUTERLINK</b>	<b>EVERTEC</b>	<b>LS INNOV ED CTR</b>	<b>SANTILLANA</b>	<b>SESCO</b>	<b>SM INC</b>	<b>GEEO</b>
<b>ELEMENTS</b>	<b>RFP FORM</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>POINTS</b>		<b>RATING</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>RATING</b>
5 <b>LEGAL ACTIONS (Potential Threats/Judgment) in Past 3 years</b>	No actions with potential adverse financial impact		10		10	10			10		
	No material actions and 1-2 Minor adverse judgments		7 to 9		(None Reported)	(None Reported)			(None Reported)		
	Legal actions posing some degree of risk of possible liability with financial impact		4 to 6								
	Recent, pending or threatened legal actions with serious adverse financial impact		1 to 3								
<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>					<b>39</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>					<b>7.8</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**THE AVERAGE OF THE TOTAL POINTS ASSIGNED FOR ELEMENTS 1-5 ABOVE WILL BE DETERMINED FOR EACH CATEGORY/PART BID BY EACH VENDOR (ROUNDED UP)**

CRITERIA #5

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTS	OBJECTIVE
Comprehensiveness of proposal for delivering all categories of requested equipment and services.	15%	2.5% FOR EACH SERVICE BRACKET STARTING WITH THE SECOND UP TO A TOTAL 15%

ONE PROPOSAL LINE BELOW MUST BE ZERO															
CRITERIA	WEIGHT	COMPUTERLINK		EVERTEC		LS INNOV ED CTR		SANTILLANA		SESCO		SM INC		GEO	
		RATING	SCORE	RATING	SCORE	RATING	SCORE	RATING	SCORE	RATING	SCORE	RATING	SCORE	RATING	SCORE
CATEGORY 1 - DEVICES_ PART A - Laptops & Carts	2.5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
CATEGORY 1 - DEVICES_ PART B - Tablets & Carts	2.5%	10	2.5%	10	2.5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
CATEGORY 2: PD, INTEGRATION & TECH TRAINING_ PART A - Laptops	2.5%	10	2.5%	10	2.5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
CATEGORY 2: PD, INTEGRATION & TECH TRAINING_ PART B - Tablets	2.5%	10	2.5%	10	2.5%	10	2.5%	10	2.5%	0	0%	10	2.5%	10	2.5%
CATEGORY 3: PROJECT MGMT__PART A - Logistics & Initial Distribution	2.5%	10	2.5%	10	2.5%	0	0%	0	0%	10	2.5%	0	0%	0	0%
CATEGORY 3: PROJECT MGMT__PART B - Tech Support, Help Desk & Ticketing System	2.5%	10	2.5%	10	2.5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
CATEGORY 3: PROJECT MGMT__PART C - Asset Inventory Management & Device Tracking	2.5%	10	2.5%	10	2.5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	<b>17.5%</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.5%</b>