

EXHIBIT G County of Alameda R-REP RFP Proposal Evaluation Matrix								
Category Weighting		Proposal Scoring Matrix						
Category Weighting	Evaluation Criteria Breakdown	Proposal Sections	0	1	2	3	4	5
A. Completeness of Response to RFP (15 Points)								
RFP A1	Informational items have been submitted. Responses to this RFP will be complete. Responses that do not include the proposal consent requirements identified within this RFP and subsequent Addenda will be considered incomplete, and be used a Fail in the Evaluation Criteria.	Exhibit B1 Checklist						
B. Technical Proposal (50 Points)								
1	Total projected energy production is realistic and accounts for production guarantees, site-specific constraints and proposed PV system design. Facility usage offset is appropriate for category maximum value.	Sections 7.a, 7.1	Missing production data or required supporting information not provided.	Energy production estimates provided but not realistic, inadequate or overly simplified and require further investigation.	Energy production meets RFP recommended system size, and system size is unrealistic or technology choice is not ideal for most sites within this bundle.	Energy production meets RFP recommended system size, and system size is realistic, technology choice appropriate for most sites in bundle.	Energy production meets or exceeds RFP recommended system size, guarantee and output based on site surveys to offset balancing energy.	Energy production realistically offsets clean levels of electricity usage based on optimal cost savings and production guarantee and does so with innovative approaches.
4	Completeness and quality of technical documentation for proposed systems including preliminary module layouts and electrical diagrams. Submittal should account for available space, proposed orientation and tilt, and site-specific construction conditions (roof type, site issues, etc.).	Sections 7.a, 7.2, 7.4, 7.4.a, 7.7, 7.1	Descriptions and documentation missing or severely limited. Technical solution unrealistic for sites and/or bundle.	All systems described, but system size is unrealistic or technology choice is not ideal for some sites within this bundle.	All systems sections addressed, presentation clear and succinct. All systems described in full, system size realistic, technology choice appropriate for most sites in bundle.	All systems sections addressed, presentation clear and succinct. All systems described in full, system size realistic, technology choice appropriate and exceed requirements in some areas.	Responses and technical documentation is outstanding and clearly presents value and rationale for technology selections with a complete set of materials to include recommendations and analysis data.	
4	Module supply, availability, and quality meets or exceeds RFP requirements and has proven track record.	Sections 7.b	Product information not provided or does not meet RFP minimum requirements, or manufacturer is in bankruptcy or has been during the past 3 years.	Product of manifestly lower quality or confirmed availability concerns.	Product is not in the top 20 by market share, and availability is uncertain or known quality concerns exist.	Product offered from a known vendor in the top 20 by market share for 2012, and meets RFP quality and availability requirements.	Product offered from a known vendor in the top 10 by market share for 2012, and exceeds RFP quality and availability requirements.	Product among top 5 industry leaders, reputable vendor, exceeds RFP quality and has confirmed availability.
3	Inverter supply, availability, and quality meets or exceeds RFP requirements.	Sections 7.b	Product information not provided or does not meet RFP minimum requirements, or manufacturer is in bankruptcy or has been during the past 3 years.	Product of manifestly lower quality or confirmed availability concerns.	Product is not in the top 10 by market share, and availability is uncertain or known quality concerns exist.	Product offered from a known vendor in the top 10 by market share for 2012, and meets RFP quality and availability requirements.	Product offered from a known vendor in the top 5 by market share for 2012, and exceeds RFP quality and availability requirements.	Product among top 3 industry leaders, reputable vendor, exceeds RFP quality and has confirmed availability.
3	Warranty periods for modules, inverter, and workmanship. Minimum 10-year/10%, and 25-year/10% performance for modules. Minimum of 10-years for inverter. Minimum of 10-years for workmanship.	7.c	Warranty information not provided or does not meet RFP minimum requirements, or provider is in bankruptcy or has been during the past 3 years.	Warranty < 10yrs inverter, <20yrs module, or manufacturer new to market (< 5 years in operation), or lacks ability to back warranty for full term.	Product warranties and performance guarantees meet RFP requirements and are not backed by well-established providers or they do not have more than 5 years to operation.	Product warranties and performance guarantees meet RFP requirements and are backed by well-established providers.	Warranty >10yrs inverter, >25yrs module, vendors have track record and operate able to honor full term.	Warranties >15 yrs inverter, >25 yrs module, vendors have 10+ years in business with ability to maintain warranty coverage in the event of business failure.
2	Monitoring system and plan for ensuring accurate billing and performance. Ability to view monitoring data online, and to provide plain view of high-level performance information.	Sections 7.g, 7.h, 7.1	Product and system information not provided, or provider is in bankruptcy or has been during the past 3 years.	System specifications insufficient for billing details on management interface and process.	Full scope provided, but vendor data hosting provided for less than 10 years with major provider.	Full RFP requirements met and vendor data hosting provided for at least 10 years with major provider.	Full RFP requirements met and vendor data hosting provided for at least 15 years with major provider.	Full RFP requirements met and vendor data hosting provided for duration of system life.
C. Proposal Pricing (25 Points)								
16	PPA Normal levelized cost of energy over a 20-year lifetime, including escalation factor.	Section 11	Cost proposal incomplete or lacking valid methodology OR above bundle avoided cost LCOE.	Validated costs will be used to generate LCOE with the lowest earning 1 point and the highest earning 1 point, except where the LCOE is higher than the avoided cost, where points awarded will be zero.				
5	Direct Purchase Normal levelized cost of energy over a 20-year lifetime, including operations and maintenance costs.	Section 11	Cost proposal incomplete or lacking valid methodology OR above bundle avoided cost LCOE.	Validated costs will be used to generate LCOE with the lowest earning 1 point and the highest earning 1 point, except where the LCOE is higher than the avoided cost, where points awarded will be zero.				
4	Costs and benefits (savings) are appropriate given proposed system size, estimated production, forecast energy use of the facility, and bidder provides information with transparent methodology.	Sections 11, 7	Cost methodology and proposal complex, but explanation is lacking or contains escalation including term, discount or inflation factors, or requires additional follow-up.	Cost methodology and proposal is missing some information or is not clear on all assumptions.	Cost methods and proposal included for whole bundle and site breakdown, but not clear and succinct narrative describing assumptions and methodology described.	Cost proposal and all supporting documentation well organized and clear. Assumptions and methodology described.	Cost proposal and all supporting documentation well organized and clear. Assumptions and methodology described.	Cost proposal and all supporting documentation well organized based on established facts and stated assumptions including savings calculations for each site and aggregate with methodology described for sites and bundle.
D. Implementation Plan and Schedule (15 Points)								
4	Project schedule and timeline are complete, realistic, with risk mitigation and escalation processes, and appropriate for RFP requirements for the relevant bundle(s).	Sections 7	Project management schedules, details and approach not provided.	Schedule is hard to understand / lacks explanation, or project lifecycle unrealistic without risk mitigation for the bundle type.	Approach to project planning and construction, including coordination with facility operations, commissioning, and risk mitigation plan is thorough and appropriate for this bundle type.	Approach to project planning, construction, including coordination with facility operations, commissioning, and risk mitigation and safety clear, thorough and appropriate for this bundle type and proposed project lifecycle.	Outstanding project plan covers all phases, including safety, risk mitigation and escalation, and supporting documentation demonstrates successful execution of projects at this scale.	
7	Project plan and schedule account for RFP submittal requirements, complexity of project and demonstrate methodology and management of multiple projects across multiple jurisdictions. Project phases and activities are appropriately sequenced and allow for sufficient review time by participating agencies and other authorities having jurisdiction.	Sections 4, 7	Implementation plan, project management approach, and/or details not sufficiently detailed, and don't demonstrate prior experience managing multiple projects concurrently.	Sufficient experience, explanation of skills and experience provided but methodology lacks detail thoroughness.	Sufficient experience, explanation of lessons learned and methodology are sufficient for bundle requirements.	Plan clearly demonstrates excellent project management skills and methodology described ability to manage concurrent projects of similar scope and scale across the entire lifecycle for government clients.	Plan clearly demonstrates excellent project management skills and methodology described ability to manage concurrent projects of similar scope and scale across the entire lifecycle for government clients. Description of lessons learned provided above RFP requirements.	
3	Local (if County Bay Area) workforce employment plan with substantial describing how bidder will meet 40% CFE and Participating Agencies unique workforce contracting requirements.	Section 11	No documentation for approach to employment for RFP. Lacks consideration of PA's unique workforce requirements.	Weak or confusing plan to provide local employment and has few established relationships with local workforce providers.	Plan provided minimally addresses RFP 40% CFE, and has few established relationships with local workforce providers.	Plan is well documented and is able to meet RFP 40% CFE, with some established relationships with local workforce employment providers and addresses some unique workforce requirements.	Plan is very well organized and provides details and prior experience documenting the ability to meet RFP 40% CFE with strong established relationships with local workforce employment providers and addresses all unique workforce requirements.	Outstanding plan that will exceed RFP 40% CFE, with strong established relationships with local workforce employment providers and addresses all project workforce requirements.
E. Financing Plan & Financial Partners (15 Points)								
6	Financial stability and ability to provide timely financing as judged by independently audited financial statements or Dun and Bradstreet report, and evidence of insurance and bonding capacity per RFP requirements.	Section 8, RFD Responses	Audited financial statements or insurance coverage, available or information not provided. Bankruptcy in the last 5 years or pending.	Inadequate insurance and bonding coverage. Financials not adequate for this scale or type of project.	Sufficient insurance and bonding coverage. Financials adequate but weak.	Sufficient insurance and bonding coverage. Financials adequate but weak.	Strong financials, insurance coverage meets or exceeds requirements, and demonstrates ability to provide financing.	Good liquidity and free cash flow. Strong financial partners, insurance and bonding coverage exceeds requirements and demonstrates ability to provide financing.
9	Proof of funding for project per RFP submittal requirements and prior experience from financing partners to successfully complete government projects, reasonable cost of financing as demonstrated in project savings model.	Section 8, RFD Responses	No definitive proof of funding provided.	Minimal examples of funding partners at the scale of the bundle type and/or insufficient demonstration of financing capability.	Funding specified, but not readily available or hard contingencies attached.	Funding specified, and comes from a dedicated fund with experience in projects up to 50 MM for similar types of projects.	Funding sources documented and have completed multiple transactions with demonstrated experience in projects greater than 50 MM for similar types of projects.	Proof of funding, outstanding experience and references that confirm existing and potential large-scale project financing that is of this bundle type with finance partner or Prime having a strong balance sheet and prior experience with 100MM+ of financial projects.
F. Proposer Qualifications & Experience (15 Points)								
6	Team (organizational) qualifications and strengths for all partners, company background and years in business.	Sections 4, 5, 6, RFP Responses	Very limited experience of described proposer team.	Bonafide limited experience of proposer team. Lacking detailed description of organizational and/or specific individual roles.	Proposer team has some applicable experience, but not well aligned to this scale or type of project.	Proposer team has directly relevant experience similar to scale and type of project and established company with minimum 3 years experience. Roles and responsibilities are clear.	Proposer team has extensive experience with similar scale and type of project, and established company with more than three years experience. Roles and responsibilities are clear.	Proposer team has extensive experience with similar scale and type of project, and established company with more than three years experience. Roles and responsibilities are clear.
6	Strength of assigned team members' years of prior experience in technical, project management and demonstrated track record of successful financing of renewable energy projects.	Sections 3, 4, 5, RFP Responses	Key team members not identified (or do not have documented experience with government projects).	Weak experience with bundle type, perhaps on a different scale.	Sufficient experience with some aspects of bundle type and financing but not all.	Project team members have directly relevant experience with most aspects of bundle type and financing.	Project team members have directly relevant experience with projects of this bundle type and financing in current roles within team management structure and roles clearly explained that cover technical, financial and project management responsibilities.	Extensive experience with projects of this bundle type and financing in current roles within team management structure and roles clearly explained that cover technical, financial and project management responsibilities.
3	Strength and relevance of references per RFP submittal requirements for all project phases.	Sections 3.4.4, 5, RFD Responses	References incomplete or not relevant to RFP requirements/project types.	Weak references provided and not sufficient to determine applicability to this bundle type.	References provided but not clearly applicable to this bundle type and not of similar scale and scope.	References provided describe prior experience with this bundle type and similar scope and scale with positive client feedback.	References provided describe very similar, successful prior experience with this bundle type and similar scope and scale with strong positive client feedback.	Outstanding references from all verified sources with exceptional reviews on project partners, the organizations and key personnel.
G. Contract Terms & Conditions (15 Points)								
3	Consistency with contract language and unique contracting requirements included in RFP specifications and Exhibits providing maximum value and lowest scheduling performance and cost risk.	Sections 3.2, 7, 10, 11	Comments indicate non-acceptance of all RFP specifications and Exhibits providing maximum value and lowest scheduling performance and cost risk.	Most terms do NOT conform to minimum specifications and present high risks to schedule, performance or cost.	Most terms conform to minimum specifications, unique contracting requirements, and present no risk to schedule, performance or cost.	All terms conform to minimum requirements, unique contracting requirements, and present no risk to schedule, performance or cost.	All terms conform to minimum requirements, unique contracting requirements, and present no risk to schedule, performance or cost and some terms exceed minimum specifications.	All terms conform to minimum requirements unique contracting requirements, and present no risk to schedule, performance or cost and most terms exceed minimum specifications.
2	Substantive of bidders template documents, acceptance of R-REP key terms and conditions, or R-REP template documents provided as part of RFP response.	Sections 3.2, 7, 10, 11	No proposer template provided and not directly related to this project type and no statement of acceptance of R-REP key terms and conditions.	Template documents provided but not directly related to this project type and no statement of acceptance of R-REP key terms and conditions.	Full and descriptive template documents that meet the expectations of the project type and generally meet the key terms and conditions.	Full and descriptive template documents that meet the expectations of the project type and generally meet the key terms and conditions.	Full and descriptive template documents that matches all the material areas of the key terms and conditions.	Full and descriptive template documents that matches completely the key terms and conditions of the R-REP template documents.
H. Oral Presentation & Interview (5 Points)								
5	Presentation quality, completeness and responsiveness to questions.	Interview & Additional Materials	No preparation for the interview and/or no presentation materials provided.	Poorly prepared for the interview and/or no relevant information to RFP response.	Interview and presentation is informative and provides upon RFP response.	Interview and presentation is informative and provides upon RFP response while addressing key risk factors and providing proposed solutions and savings for all sites within the bid bundle.	Interview and presentation is informative and provides upon RFP response while addressing key risk factors and providing proposed solutions and savings for all sites within the bid bundle.	Outstanding presentation and follow-up to questions with affirmations to proposal that enhance the viability of proposed projects, reduce risks for all participating agencies and provides savings for all sites within the bid bundle.
100 TOTAL Unscored Weighting								