Scoring Summary

Operations Model Assessment Criteria	*Established Weights***	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
		*Scores**	*Scores**	*Scores**	*Scores**
Customer Experience	*35%*	2 Model 1 tends to: - create customer confusion - require high efforts to coordinate schedules -potential for lack of alignment between fare enforcement and optimizing revenue - have least public facing presence - give least opportunity to influence IDEA	5 Model 2 tends to: - provide seamless customer experience - require high efforts to coordinate schedules - enable the City to control alignment between fare enforcement and optimizing revenue - provide more public profile (presence) - give increased opportunity to consider socio-economic factors - provide minimal opportunity to influence IDEA	6 Model 3 tends to: - provide a seamless customer experience - require significant efforts to coordinate schedules - enable the City to control alignment between fare enforcement and optimizing revenue - provide more public profile (presence) - give increased opportunity to consider socio-economic factors - provide moderate opportunity to influence IDEA	7 Model 4 tends to: - provide the most seamless customer experience - offer seamless schedule coordination - enable the City to seamlessly control alignment between fare enforcement and optimizing revenue - provide most public profile (presence) - give highest opportunity to consider socio-economic factors - provide highest opportunity to influence IDEA
Accountability - Interfaces between parties (No. of Interfaces, Complexity and ease of mitigation)	*30%*	6 Tends to contemplate consistent number of interfaces compared to Model 2, with Moderate complexity	7 Tends to contemplate consistent number of known interfaces compared to Model 1, with reduced complexity (low to moderate)	5 Tends to contemplate highest number of known interfaces compared to the other models, with moderate to high complexity	6 Tends to contemplate a new set of known interfaces, with moderate to high complexity

Operations Model Assessment Criteria	*Established Weights***	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
		*Scores**	*Scores**	*Scores**	*Scores**
Risks and Liabilities (Consequence, Likelihood, Overall Risk)	*25%*	8 Tends to contemplate consistent number of known risks compared to Model 2, with low to moderate overall risk	9 Tends to contemplate consistent number of known risks compared to Model 1, with low to moderate overall risk	6 Tends to contemplate highest number of known risks compared to other models (driver-related collision risks now transferred to the City), with medium to high overall risk.	5 Tends to contemplate new set of known risks associated with Light Rail Vehicle and driver-related collision (these risks are transferred to the City), with medium to high overall risk.
Cost (Cost certainty, Upfront and Ongoing Cost)	*10%*	6 Tends to provide the City with high cost certainty, minimal upfront cost and low ongoing cost with the lowest overall cost to be the City	6 Tends to provide the City medium cost certainty, low upfront cost and low ongoing cost with the second lowest overall cost to be the City	3 Tends to provide the City low cost certainty, medium upfront cost and medium ongoing cost with the second highest overall cost to be the City	2 Tends to provide the City minimal cost certainty, high upfront cost and high ongoing cost with the highest overall cost to be the City
Weighted Scores***		5	7	5	6

** A higher score translates to more benefit to the City (more favorable to the City)*

*** Level of importance to the City for each criterion i.e. the higher weight means the criterion is more important to the City*

***Scores for Operations Models accounting for the criterion's level of importance (weight) to the City