Proposal Evaluation Scoring Form

RFP #1-25-26 – Network Equipment UPS

[redacted]

Date: 7/29/25

Vendor/Proposer Name: Aztek Computers

Please score each section based on the criteria and maximum points provided. Use whole numbers only.

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Score Awarded	Comments
E-rate Eligible Cost	45		
E-rate Ineligible Cost	5		
Management Capability & Features	25		
Vendor Stability & Manufacturer Ability to Execute	15		
California K-12 School District References	10		
TOTAL	100		

Additional Comments:

Disqualified – Submitted late bid

Proposal Evaluation Scoring Form

RFP #1-25-26 – Network Equipment UPS

[redacted]

Date: 7/29/25

Vendor/Proposer Name: Battery Backup Systems

Please score each section based on the criteria and maximum points provided. Use whole numbers only.

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Score Awarded	Comments
E-rate Eligible Cost	45	17	Highest per unit cost of all vendors
E-rate Ineligible Cost	5	5	N/A
Management Capability & Features	25	25	
Vendor Stability & Manufacturer Ability to Execute	15	5	Missing Section 1 – Vendor Profile
California K-12 School District References	10	5	No K-12 References
TOTAL	100	57	

Additional Comments:

_____

_____

Proposal Evaluation Scoring Form

RFP #1-25-26 – Network Equipment UPS

[redacted]

Date: 7/29/25

Vendor/Proposer Name: CDWG

Please score each section based on the criteria and maximum points provided. Use whole numbers only.

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Score Awarded	Comments
E-rate Eligible Cost	45	41	Best Pricing, with alternate solution Vertiv
E-rate Ineligible Cost	5	5	N/A
Management Capability & Features	25	20	Equipment RU Size, Space Concerns
Vendor Stability & Manufacturer Ability to Execute	15	15	
California K-12 School District References	10	10	
TOTAL	100	91	

Additional Comments:

Vendor provided an alternative to the requested APC solution. Vertiv is similar in functionality, However, the main UPS is 2U instead of 1U making the overall design 3U rather than 2U and could affect the way it is installed in some locations.

Proposal Evaluation Scoring Form

RFP #1-25-26 – Network Equipment UPS

[redacted]

Date: 7/29/25

Vendor/Proposer Name: ConvergeOne

Please score each section based on the criteria and maximum points provided. Use whole numbers only.

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Score Awarded	Comments
E-rate Eligible Cost	45	35	Overall pricing higher than other vendors
E-rate Ineligible Cost	5	5	N/A
Management Capability & Features	25	20	Equipment RU Size, Space Concerns
Vendor Stability & Manufacturer Ability to Execute	15	15	
California K-12 School District References	10	8	
TOTAL	100	83	

Additional Comments:

Vendor provided an alternative to the requested APC solution. Eaton is similar in functionality, However, the main UPS is 2U instead of 1U making the overall design 3U rather than 2U and could affect the way it is installed in some locations.

Proposal Evaluation Scoring Form

RFP #1-25-26 – Network Equipment UPS

[redacted]

Date: 7/29/25

Vendor/Proposer Name: Cybertek

Please score each section based on the criteria and maximum points provided. Use whole numbers only.

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Score Awarded	Comments
E-rate Eligible Cost	45	23	High equipment pricing
E-rate Ineligible Cost	5	5	
Management Capability & Features	25	25	
Vendor Stability & Manufacturer Ability to Execute	15	15	
California K-12 School District References	10	10	
TOTAL	100	78	

Additional Comments:

Solution provided included an updated sku for Licensing

Proposal Evaluation Scoring Form

RFP #1-25-26 – Network Equipment UPS

[redacted]

Date: 7/29/25

Vendor/Proposer Name: GigaKom

Please score each section based on the criteria and maximum points provided. Use whole numbers only.

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Score Awarded	Comments
E-rate Eligible Cost	45	24	High equipment pricing
E-rate Ineligible Cost	5	5	
Management Capability & Features	25	25	
Vendor Stability & Manufacturer Ability to Execute	15	15	
California K-12 School District References	10	10	
TOTAL	100	79	

Additional Comments:

_____

_____

Proposal Evaluation Scoring Form

RFP #1-25-26 – Network Equipment UPS

[redacted]

Date: 7/29/25

Vendor/Proposer Name: NIC Partners

Please score each section based on the criteria and maximum points provided. Use whole numbers only.

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Score Awarded	Comments
E-rate Eligible Cost	45	37	Best pricing for APC Equipment, Overall pricing very close to alternatives
E-rate Ineligible Cost	5	5	N/A
Management Capability & Features	25	25	
Vendor Stability & Manufacturer Ability to Execute	15	15	
California K-12 School District References	10	10	
TOTAL	100	92	

Additional Comments:

_____

_____

Proposal Evaluation Scoring Form

RFP #1-25-26 – Network Equipment UPS

[redacted]

Date: 7/29/25

Vendor/Proposer Name: Projectized Solutions

Please score each section based on the criteria and maximum points provided. Use whole numbers only.

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Score Awarded	Comments
E-rate Eligible Cost	45	30	Pricing not correct for licensing. Not best pricing for equipment.
E-rate Ineligible Cost	5	5	
Management Capability & Features	25	25	
Vendor Stability & Manufacturer Ability to Execute	15	10	
California K-12 School District References	10	8	Not UPS Specific, Small Projects
TOTAL	100	78	

Additional Comments:

Errors found in pricing for licensing of APC Software

Proposal Evaluation Scoring Form

RFP #1-25-26 – Network Equipment UPS

[redacted]

Date: 7/29/25

Vendor/Proposer Name: Riverside Technologies

Please score each section based on the criteria and maximum points provided. Use whole numbers only.

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Score Awarded	Comments
E-rate Eligible Cost	45	45	No Software licensing provided for management
E-rate Ineligible Cost	5	5	
Management Capability & Features	25	15	No information on central management, licenses
Vendor Stability & Manufacturer Ability to Execute	15	8	Equipment RU Size, Space Concerns
California K-12 School District References	10	8	
TOTAL	100	81	

Additional Comments:

Vendor provided an alternative to the requested APC solution. N1C is similar in functionality, However, the main UPS is 2U instead of 1U making the overall design 4U rather than 2U and could affect the way it is installed in some locations.

Proposal Evaluation Scoring Form

RFP #1-25-26 – Network Equipment UPS

[redacted]

Date: 7/29/25

Vendor/Proposer Name: Vector USA

Please score each section based on the criteria and maximum points provided. Use whole numbers only.

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Score Awarded	Comments
E-rate Eligible Cost	45	39	Good pricing, with alternative solution
E-rate Ineligible Cost	5	5	N/A
Management Capability & Features	25	20	Equipment RU Size, Space Concerns
Vendor Stability & Manufacturer Ability to Execute	15	15	
California K-12 School District References	10	10	
TOTAL	100	89	

Additional Comments:

Vendor provided an alternative to the requested APC solution. Vertiv is similar in functionality, However, the main UPS is 2U instead of 1U making the overall design 3U rather than 2U and could affect the way it is installed in some locations.