

EXHIBIT A
Project - HRIS/Payroll Solution Modernization Project
RFP25129 - Round 1

MWBE Commitment		Reference List of Government Clients		Qualification and Experience		Implementation Approach		Price Value		Business Requirements RTM	
Percent goal met or good faith	Point	Response	Points	Response	Point	Response	Points	Response	Points	Response	Points
Certified M/WBE Compliance-Primary Vendor. (1) Submitted their M/WBE certificate in their proposal; OR (2) Will award required portion of the project to a named M/WBE certified subcontractor; OR (3) Has certified they made a good faith effort to comply but were unable to locate a qualified M/WBE subcontractor.	5	Superior - The proposer provides an extensive list of government clients with multiple relevant projects completed for cities, counties, or other government agencies of similar size and complexity to the current project. References from these clients are highly relevant and include projects that closely align with the scope and objectives of the current RFP. The reference list includes contact information and details about the specific projects (e.g., timelines, outcomes, and budgets). The proposer has consistently received positive feedback from these government clients, with a track record of on-time, on-budget delivery and successful post-implementation support.	5	Superior - The proposer demonstrates exceptional qualifications and experience that are highly relevant to the project's goals and needs. Their experience includes multiple successful projects of similar size, scope, and complexity, particularly in the public sector or similar industries. The team assigned to the project has extensive expertise, and their roles are clearly defined. The proposer includes key personnel with proven leadership in similar projects. Additional materials (such as appendices) include comprehensive and relevant information requested, demonstrating a strong ability to handle additional or unexpected requirements.	5	Superior - Proposer provides a detailed, realistic implementation timeline, a well-defined overall plan, and a system with proven scalability for future growth. A single, comprehensive system that meets all city needs or fully integrated multiple systems that function seamlessly together.	5	Lowest cost compared to other proposals	5	90-100% of requirements met: Proposer fully meets or exceeds nearly all functional requirements.	5
		Above Average - The proposer provides a solid list of government clients, with several completed projects for government agencies similar in size or complexity to the current project. References from these clients are relevant and include projects that are mostly aligned with the current project's goals. The list includes adequate contact information and details for each reference, but may lack depth in project descriptions or feedback. The proposer has received mostly positive feedback, with some minor issues reported, though overall project outcomes were successful.	4	Above Average - The proposer has strong qualifications and relevant experience that align well with the project's goals and needs. They have a good track record with several successful projects of similar scope and complexity, though they may lack direct experience in some areas. The project team is well-qualified, and roles are defined, but there may be minor gaps in expertise for certain areas. Additional materials are thorough, with most requested information provided and relevant, though not as comprehensive as expected.	4	Above Average - Proposer provides a strong timeline and plan, with some minor gaps in clarity or scalability. One comprehensive system with minor gaps or multiple systems with strong integration and functionality.	4	Less than 10% above lowest proposal	4	80-89% of requirements met: Proposer meets most functional requirements, with minor gaps.	4
Not Qualified. Vendors proposal indicated that they do not qualify for the M/WBE certification nor do they comply with the M/WBE subcontract participation requirement.	0	Average - The proposer provides a moderate list of government clients, with some experience working on projects for government agencies, but the scope or complexity of the projects may vary. References are provided, but not all projects align closely with the current RFP in terms of scope, complexity, or objectives. The reference list includes basic contact information, but details about the projects may be limited or missing. Feedback from government clients is generally positive, but there may be noticeable gaps in performance or outcomes (e.g., delays or budget overruns).	3	Average - The proposer meets the qualifications and has adequate experience to handle the project. They have completed similar projects, but their experience may not align perfectly with the size, scope, or complexity of this particular project. The project team has the necessary skills, but there may be noticeable gaps in expertise, or roles may not be clearly defined. Additional materials provide basic information, though some requested items may be missing, incomplete, or only partially relevant.	3	Average - Proposer presents an adequate timeline and plan, with moderate concerns regarding implementation or scalability. Multiple systems with moderate integration, but some gaps in functionality or user experience.	3	10% - 25% above lowest proposal	3	70-79% of requirements met: Proposer meets a significant portion of the requirements but has some notable gaps.	3
		Below Average - The proposer provides a limited list of government clients, with only a few relevant projects completed for government agencies. References may include projects that differ significantly in scope or complexity from the current project, with limited relevance to the current RFP. The reference list may be missing contact information or lacks sufficient details about the projects. Feedback from government clients may be mixed, with some significant concerns raised about project delivery, support, or outcomes.	2	Below Average - The proposer has limited qualifications or experience relevant to the project. They have completed a few projects that are only somewhat similar in size or scope, with limited or no direct experience in key areas. The project team has significant gaps in expertise or lacks clarity in defined roles, which raises concerns about their ability to successfully complete the project. Additional materials are incomplete, missing key information, or only loosely related to the project requirements.	2	Below Average - Proposer shows some weaknesses in the timeline or plan, and scalability is limited. Multiple systems with significant challenges in integration or usability.	2	26% - 40% above lowest proposal	2	60-69% of requirements met: Proposer meets the minimum acceptable requirements but has significant gaps.	2
		Poor - The proposer provides minimal references for government clients, with very few or no relevant projects completed for government agencies. References are provided for projects that are largely unrelated to the current RFP, with no clear alignment to the project's scope or objectives. The reference list lacks essential contact information or project details. Feedback from government clients indicates poor performance, significant delays, budget overruns, or unresolved issues during or after the project.	1	Poor - The proposer has minimal qualifications and experience relevant to the project. Their experience with similar projects is very limited, with no clear examples of success in comparable efforts. The project team lacks the necessary expertise, with major concerns about their ability to deliver on key project requirements. Additional materials are sparse or largely irrelevant, failing to provide the requested information.	1	Poor - Proposer provides a weak timeline and plan with major concerns regarding scalability. Poorly integrated systems that create complexity and inefficiency.	1	Greater than 40% above lowest proposal	0	50-59% of requirements met: Proposer meets fewer than expected requirements, with major gaps in functionality.	1
		Deficient - The proposer provides no relevant government client references. There are no projects listed that are aligned with government work, or the references provided are completely irrelevant to the current RFP. No contact information or project details are provided. Feedback from government clients, if available, is overwhelmingly negative, with significant issues that suggest the proposer is not capable of managing the project.	0	Deficient - The proposer has no relevant qualifications or experience. No examples or case studies are provided to demonstrate past work. The project team has no apparent expertise relevant to the project, or key personnel are missing entirely. Additional materials are either completely missing or irrelevant to the evaluation criteria.	0	Deficient - Proposer has no viable timeline, plan, or scalability. Systems are pieced together with no meaningful integration, making them difficult to manage.	0			Less than 50% of requirements met: Proposer fails to meet the majority of functional requirements.	0

Business Name: Creol (Oracle)			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	0.00	0.00
Reference List of Government Clients	5.00	1.33	6.67
Qualification and Experience	20.00	3.00	60.00
Implementation Approach	20.00	3.56	71.11
Price Value	10.00	0.00	0.00
Business Requirements RTM	25.00	4.00	100.00
Final Score			237.78
			Max Score = 500

Firm Name: AST (Oracle)			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Reference List of Government Clients	5.00	3.22	16.11
Qualification and Experience	20.00	3.67	73.33
Implementation Approach	20.00	3.44	68.89
Price Value	10.00	0.00	0.00
Business Requirements RTM	25.00	5.00	125.00
Final Score			383.33
			Max Score = 500

Firm Name: Kroms (UKG)			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	0.00	0.00
Reference List of Government Clients	5.00	3.78	18.89
Qualification and Experience	20.00	3.89	77.78
Implementation Approach	20.00	3.44	68.89
Price Value	10.00	0.00	0.00
Business Requirements RTM	25.00	5.00	125.00
Final Score			290.56
			Max Score = 500

Firm Name: PDS (Vista)			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	0.00	0.00
Reference List of Government Clients	5.00	3.56	17.78
Qualification and Experience	20.00	3.56	71.11
Implementation Approach	20.00	3.44	68.89
Price Value	10.00	0.00	0.00
Business Requirements RTM	25.00	5.00	125.00
Final Score			282.78
			Max Score = 500

Firm Name: OnAcute (Dayforce)			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Reference List of Government Clients	5.00	4.00	20.00
Qualification and Experience	20.00	3.67	73.33
Implementation Approach	20.00	3.44	68.89
Price Value	10.00	0.00	0.00
Business Requirements RTM	25.00	5.00	125.00
Final Score			387.22
			Max Score = 500

Firm Name: ADP			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	0.00	0.00
Reference List of Government Clients	5.00	3.78	18.89
Qualification and Experience	20.00	3.89	77.78
Implementation Approach	20.00	3.44	68.89
Price Value	10.00	0.00	0.00
Business Requirements RTM	25.00	5.00	125.00
Final Score			290.56
			Max Score = 500

Firm Name: PeopleGuru			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	5.00	100.00
Reference List of Government Clients	5.00	4.22	21.11
Qualification and Experience	20.00	3.56	71.11
Implementation Approach	20.00	3.44	68.89
Price Value	10.00	0.00	0.00
Business Requirements RTM	25.00	0.00	0.00
Final Score			261.11
			Max Score = 500

Firm Name: Collaborative Solutions (Workday)			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	0.00	0.00
Reference List of Government Clients	5.00	3.67	18.33
Qualification and Experience	20.00	3.56	71.11
Implementation Approach	20.00	1.89	37.78
Price Value	10.00	5.00	50.00
Business Requirements RTM	25.00	5.00	125.00
Final Score			302.22
			Max Score = 500

Firm Name: Strada (Workday)			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	0.00	0.00
Reference List of Government Clients	5.00	4.00	20.00
Qualification and Experience	20.00	3.22	64.44
Implementation Approach	20.00	4.11	82.22
Price Value	10.00	0.00	0.00
Business Requirements RTM	25.00	5.00	125.00
Final Score			291.67
			Max Score = 500

Firm Name: AVAAP (Workday)			
Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Grade	Total
MWBE Commitment	20.00	0.00	0.00
Reference List of Government Clients	5.00	4.33	21.67
Qualification and Experience	20.00	3.78	75.56
Implementation Approach	20.00	4.11	82.22
Price Value	10.00	0.00	0.00
Business Requirements RTM	25.00	5.00	125.00
Final Score			304.44
			Max Score = 500