

# Mid-Market Grid<sup>®</sup> Report for RFP

## Winter 2025



### RFP Software

Contenders					Leaders				
Niche					High Performers				

Market Presence

Satisfaction

G2 Grid<sup>®</sup> Scoring

(RFP Software continues on next page)

# RFP Software (continued)

## RFP Software Definition

Request for proposal (RFP) software, sometimes referred to as request for quotation (RFQ) software, helps companies create and manage RFP documents, as well as the processes used for vendors to respond to proposals or questionnaires outlining their products or services, pricing, and other relevant information. Companies use RFP software to streamline the creation of RFP documents, track submissions, and analyze the efficiency of their RFP activities. This type of software is used by buyers or procurement professionals to invite bidders to participate in RFPs and compare them to determine the best proposal. In addition, vendors, as well as sales and marketing teams, use this type of strategic response management software to submit RFP responses, track the results of their submissions, collaborate with other stakeholders, and maintain a content library.

RFP software usually includes features for proposal management and integrates with other products such as [purchasing software](#), [strategic sourcing software](#), and [proposal software](#).

To qualify for inclusion in the Request for Proposal (RFP) category, a product must:

- ▶ Provide standard templates to create RFP documents
- ▶ Generate quotes and proposals based on RFP documents
- ▶ Provide a repository of documents and templates which can be used to quickly generate request for proposals
- ▶ Integrate with solutions like CRM and CPQ to pull product and customer data
- ▶ Offer functionality to quickly and efficiently create, share, and send request for proposals, allow edits and feedback during the proposal process, and track changes made
- ▶ Include analytics to evaluate the efficiency of the proposal process
- ▶ Compare RFP responses based on custom selection criteria
- ▶ Maintain a history and audit trail of submissions, responses, and supplier details, which can be used to create new RFP documents

## Mid-Market RFP Grid® Scoring Description

Products shown on the Mid-Market Grid® for RFP have received a minimum of 10 reviews/ratings in data gathered by November 19, 2024. Products are ranked by customer satisfaction (based on user reviews) and market presence (based on market share, seller size, and social impact) and placed into four categories on the Grid®:

- ▶ Products in the Leader quadrant are rated highly by G2 users and have substantial Market Presence scores. Leaders include: [Responsive](#), [formerly RFPIO](#) and [Loopio](#)
- ▶ High Performing products have high customer Satisfaction scores and low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. High Performers include: [Iup](#) and [Tribble](#)
- ▶ Contender products have relatively low customer Satisfaction scores and high Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. Contenders include: [Upland Qvidian](#)
- ▶ Niche products have relatively low Satisfaction scores and low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. Niche products include: [QorusDocs](#), [Zip](#), [Precoro](#), [Ombud](#), [RocketDocs](#), and [Olive](#)



# Grid® Scores for Mid-Market RFP Software

The table below shows the Satisfaction and Market Presence scores that determine product placement on the Mid-Market Grid®. To learn more about each of the products, please see the profile section.

## Leaders

	# of Reviews	Satisfaction	Market Presence	G2 Score
<a href="#">Responsive, formerly RFPIO</a>	512	95	95	95
<a href="#">Loopio</a>	315	81	93	87

## High Performers

<a href="#">Iup</a>	16	69	35	52
<a href="#">Tribble</a>	36	80	23	51

## Contenders

<a href="#">Upland Qvidian</a>	23	46	71	58
--------------------------------	----	----	----	----

## Niche

<a href="#">QorusDocs</a>	39	35	24	29
<a href="#">Zip</a>	12	17	41	29
<a href="#">Precoro</a>	33	32	26	29
<a href="#">Ombud</a>	11	25	18	21
<a href="#">RocketDocs</a>	42	28	12	20
<a href="#">Olive</a>	20	26	7	17

\* Products are ordered by G2 Score. Satisfaction score is used as a tiebreaker if two products have the same G2 Score.

# Grid® Methodology

## Grid® Rating Methodology

The Grid® represents the democratic voice of real software users, rather than the subjective opinion of one analyst. G2 rates products from the RFP category algorithmically based on data sourced from product reviews shared by G2 users and data aggregated from online sources and social networks.

Technology buyers can use the Grid® to help them quickly select the best products for their businesses and to find peers with similar experiences. For sellers, media, investors, and analysts, the Grid® provides benchmarks for product comparison and market trend analysis.

## Segmented Grid® Scoring Methodology

When viewing a Grid® by segment size, the same Grid® scoring methodology applies. However, the review data used is only from reviewers who are employed by a company within a particular company segment.

G2 uses the following definitions for company segments:

- ▶ Small-Business Review: A review from someone who works at a company with 50 or fewer employees
- ▶ Mid-Market Review: A review from someone who works at a company with 51-1,000 employees
- ▶ Enterprise Review: A review from someone who works at a company with 1,001+ employees

## Grid® Scoring Methodology

The Grid® Report for RFP | Winter 2025 is based on reviews collected through November 19, 2024. We apply unique algorithms to this data to calculate Satisfaction (v4.0) and Market Presence (v7.0) scores for the Winter 2025 report quarter. To view the RFP Grid® with the most recent data, please visit the [RFP](#) page. For more details on Grid® Scoring, please view the [G2 Scoring Methodology here](#).

## Grid® Categorization Methodology

Making G2 research relevant and easy for people to use as they evaluate and select business software products is one of our most important goals. In support of that goal, organizing products and software companies in a well-defined structure that makes capturing, evaluating, and displaying reviews and other research in an orderly manner is a critical part of the research process.

To manage the process of categorizing the software products and the related reviews in the G2 community, G2 follows a publicly available [categorization methodology](#). All products appearing on the Grid® have passed through G2's categorization methodology and meet G2's category standards.

Many terms that appear regularly across G2 and are used to aid in product categorization warrant a definition to facilitate buyer understanding. These terms may be included within reviews from the G2 community or in executive summaries for products included on the Grid®. A [list of standard definitions](#) is available to G2 users to eliminate confusion and ease the buying process.

*(Grid® Methodology continues on next page)*

\*\*Net Promoter, Net Promoter System, Net Promoter Score, NPS and the NPS-related emoticons are registered trademarks of Bain & Company, Inc., Fred Reichheld and Satmetrix Systems, Inc.



# Grid® Methodology (continued)

## Rating Changes and Dynamics

The ratings in this report are based on a snapshot of the user reviews and third-party data collected by G2 up through November 19, 2024. The ratings may change as the products are further developed, the sellers grow, and as additional opinions are shared by users. G2 updates the ratings on its website in real time as additional data is received, and this report will be updated as significant data is received. By improving their products and support and/or by having more satisfied customer voices heard, Contenders may become Leaders and Niche sellers may become High Performers.

## Trust

Keeping our ratings unbiased is our top priority. G2 follows defined community guidelines to ensure privacy, and authenticity for users and reviews. For more details, please view the [G2 Community Guidelines here](#).

## Grid® Inclusion Criteria

All products in a G2 category that have at least 10 reviews from real users of the product are included on the Grid®. Inviting other users, such as colleagues and peers, to join G2 and share authentic product reviews will accelerate this process.

If a product is not yet listed on G2 and it fits the market definition above, then users are encouraged to [suggest its addition](#) to our [RFP category](#).

## Product Profiles

Product profiles and detailed charts are included for products with 10 or more reviews.




# Responsive, formerly RFPIO

4.5 ★★★★★ (1,086)



Responsive, formerly RFPIO has been named a Leader based on receiving a high customer Satisfaction score and having a large Market Presence. Responsive, formerly RFPIO has the largest Market Presence and received the highest Satisfaction score among products in RFP. 96% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 90% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Responsive, formerly RFPIO at a rate of 91%. Responsive, formerly RFPIO is also in the Vendor Security and Privacy Assessment, Document Generation, Salesforce AppExchange Apps, Proposal, and Strategic Sourcing categories.


## Satisfaction Ratings




## Top Industries Represented



## Highest-Rated Features



## Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership  
Responsive



HQ Location  
Beaverton, Oregon



Year Founded  
2016



Employees (Listed  
On LinkedIn)  
610



Company Website  
[responsive.io](https://responsive.io)




# Loopio

4.7 ★★★★★ (622)



Loopio has been named a Leader based on receiving a high customer Satisfaction score and having a large Market Presence. 99% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 96% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Loopio at a rate of 95%. Loopio is also in the Proposal, Salesforce AppExchange Apps, and Vendor Security and Privacy Assessment categories.


## Satisfaction Ratings




## Top Industries Represented



## Highest-Rated Features



## Lowest-Rated Features



**Ownership**  
Loopio Inc.



**HQ Location**  
Toronto



**Year Founded**  
2014



**Employees (Listed On LinkedIn)**  
274



**Company Website**  
[www.loopio.com](http://www.loopio.com)




1up

4.9 ★★★★★ (20)



1up has been named a High Performer product based on having high customer Satisfaction scores and a low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. 100% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 100% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend 1up at a rate of 98%. 1up is also in the Enterprise Search Software and Q&A Platforms categories.


### Satisfaction Ratings




### Top Industries Represented



### Highest-Rated Features



### Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership  
1up



HQ Location  
New York



Year Founded  
2021



Employees (Listed  
On LinkedIn)  
23



Company Website  
[1up.ai](https://1up.ai)






# Tribble

4.9 ★★★★★ (53)



Tribble has been named a High Performer product based on having high customer Satisfaction scores and a low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. 100% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 100% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Tribble at a rate of 99%.


## Satisfaction Ratings




## Top Industries Represented



## Highest-Rated Features



## Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership  
Tribble



HQ Location  
Los Angeles, CA



Year Founded  
2023



Employees (Listed  
On LinkedIn)  
11



Company Website  
[tribble.ai](https://tribble.ai)




# Upland Qvidian


4.3 ★★★★★ (112)

Upland Qvidian has been named a Contender product based on having a relatively low customer Satisfaction score and large Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. 96% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 91% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Upland Qvidian at a rate of 88%. Upland Qvidian is also in the Proposal category.


## Satisfaction Ratings




## Top Industries Represented



## Highest-Rated Features



## Lowest-Rated Features



 <b>Ownership</b> Upland Software	 <b>HQ Location</b> Austin, TX	 <b>Year Founded</b> 2010	 <b>Employees (Listed On LinkedIn)</b> 1,030	 <b>Company Website</b> <a href="https://uplandsoftware.com">uplandsoftware.com</a>
---	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	--	---




# QorusDocs


4.4 ★★★★★ (165)

QorusDocs has been named a Niche product based on having a relatively low Satisfaction score and low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. 90% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 86% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend QorusDocs at a rate of 88%. QorusDocs is also in the Sales Enablement, Proposal, and Document Generation categories.


## Satisfaction Ratings




## Top Industries Represented



## Highest-Rated Features



## Lowest-Rated Features



**Ownership**  
QorusDocs



**HQ Location**  
Seattle, WA



**Year Founded**  
2012



**Employees (Listed On LinkedIn)**  
60



**Company Website**  
[qorusdocs.com](https://qorusdocs.com)




# Zip

4.7 ★★★★★ (53)

Zip has been named a Niche product based on having a relatively low Satisfaction score and low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. 100% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 75% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Zip at a rate of 97%. Zip is also in the Accounts Payable (AP) and Spend Analysis, Procure to Pay, Spend Management, Supplier Relationship Management (SRM), Enterprise Payment, AP Automation, Invoice Management, Strategic Sourcing, Purchasing, and Vendor Management categories.

## Satisfaction Ratings



## Top Industries Represented



**Ownership**  
Zip



**HQ Location**  
San Francisco, US



**Year Founded**  
2020



**Employees (Listed On LinkedIn)**  
603



**Company Website**  
[ziphq.com](http://ziphq.com)




# Precoro


4.7 ★★★★★ (158)

Precoro has been named a Niche product based on having a relatively low Satisfaction score and low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. 100% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 96% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Precoro at a rate of 98%. Precoro is also in the Accounts Payable (AP) and Spend Analysis, Procure to Pay, Spend Management, Strategic Sourcing, Vendor Management, Purchasing, and Expense Management categories.


## Satisfaction Ratings




## Top Industries Represented



## Highest-Rated Features



## Lowest-Rated Features



**Ownership**  
Precoro



**HQ Location**  
Brooklyn, New York



**Year Founded**  
2014



**Employees (Listed On LinkedIn)**  
103



**Company Website**  
[precoro.com](https://precoro.com)




# Ombud


4.7 ★★★★★ (25)

Ombud has been named a Niche product based on having a relatively low Satisfaction score and low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. 100% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 100% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Ombud at a rate of 91%. Ombud is also in the Proposal and Vendor Security and Privacy Assessment categories.

## Satisfaction Ratings



## Top Industries Represented



\*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question.

<p><b>Ownership</b> Ombud</p>	<p><b>HQ Location</b> Denver, Colorado</p>	<p><b>Year Founded</b> 2011</p>	<p><b>Employees (Listed On LinkedIn)</b> 43</p>	<p><b>Company Website</b> <a href="http://www.ombud.com">www.ombud.com</a></p>
-----------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	---	--




# RocketDocs


4.2 ★★★★★ (101)

RocketDocs has been named a Niche product based on having a relatively low Satisfaction score and low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. 95% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 86% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend RocketDocs at a rate of 85%. RocketDocs is also in the Document Generation, Proposal, and Salesforce AppExchange Apps categories.


## Satisfaction Ratings




## Top Industries Represented



## Highest-Rated Features



## Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership  
RocketDocs



HQ Location  
Dallas, TX



Year Founded  
1994



Employees (Listed  
On LinkedIn)  
24



Company Website  
[rocketdocs.com](https://rocketdocs.com)




# Olive


4.4 ★★★★★ (55)

Olive has been named a Niche product based on having a relatively low Satisfaction score and low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. 85% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 82% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Olive at a rate of 84%. Olive is also in the Requirements Management, Technology Research Services, and Strategic Sourcing categories.


## Satisfaction Ratings




## Top Industries Represented



## Highest-Rated Features



## Lowest-Rated Features



 <b>Ownership</b> Olive Technologies	 <b>HQ Location</b> Vancouver, Canada	 <b>Year Founded</b> 2018	 <b>Employees (Listed On LinkedIn)</b> 23	 <b>Company Website</b> <a href="http://www.olive.app">www.olive.app</a>
--	---	---------------------------------	---	--





# Satisfaction Ratings for RFP

G2 reviewers rated software sellers ability to satisfy their needs as shown in the table below.

	Satisfaction		Satisfaction by Category						Net Promoter Score (NPS)
	Likelihood to Recommend	Product Going in Right Direction?	Meets Requirements	Ease of Admin	Ease of Doing Business With	Quality of Support	Ease of Setup	Ease of Use	
<b>Responsive, formerly RFPIO</b>	91%	90%	91%	89%	94%	93%	89%	88%	69
<b>Loopio</b>	95%	96%	93%	93%	97%	98%	90%	94%	87
<b>1up</b>	98%	100%	97%	95%	100%	100%	100%	96%	93
<b>Tribble</b>	99%	100%	97%	95%	100%	99%	88%	96%	100
<b>Upland Qvidian</b>	88%	91%	88%	89%	97%	91%	89%	86%	52
<b>QorusDocs</b>	88%	86%	88%	83%	92%	93%	70%	87%	48
<b>Zip</b>	97%	N/A	88%	90%	98%	93%	94%	93%	91
<b>Precoro</b>	98%	96%	93%	98%	98%	98%	95%	94%	100
<b>Ombud</b>	91%	N/A	89%	N/A	N/A	97%	N/A	94%	72
<b>RocketDocs</b>	85%	86%	85%	85%	90%	90%	83%	85%	47
<b>Olive</b>	84%	82%	87%	89%	96%	95%	89%	82%	45
<b>Average</b>	92%	92%	90%	91%	96%	95%	89%	90%	73

\*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question.

\*\*Net Promoter Score ranges from -100 to +100



# Feature Comparison for RFP

G2 users have evaluated the following products by feature. Feature ratings are representative of reviewers overall satisfaction with each feature and do not necessarily take into account the breadth of individual product features. The results are shown below.

## RFP Generation

	Templates	RFX	Versioning	Questions Library
<b>Responsive, formerly RFPIO</b>	80%	86%	83%	91%
<b>Loopio</b>	85%	93%	88%	95%
<b>1up</b>	81%	96%	79%	97%
<b>Tribble</b>	87%	98%	89%	94%
<b>Upland Qvidian</b>	82%	75%	82%	83%
<b>QorusDocs</b>	87%	87%	93%	82%
<b>Zip</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Precoro</b>	92%	84%	92%	93%
<b>Ombud</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>RocketDocs</b>	79%	80%	73%	86%
<b>Olive</b>	82%	75%	77%	70%
<b>Average</b>	84%	86%	84%	88%

(Feature Comparison for RFP continues on next page)

\*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question.

\*\*A blank box indicates that a seller has selected that they do not offer that feature.



# Feature Comparison for RFP (continued)

G2 users have evaluated the following products by feature. Feature ratings are representative of reviewers overall satisfaction with each feature and do not necessarily take into account the breadth of individual product features. The results are shown below.

## RFP Distribution

	Tracking	Analysis	Selection
<b>Responsive, formerly RFPIO</b>	87%	81%	83%
<b>Loopio</b>			
<b>1up</b>	89%	82%	89%
<b>Tribble</b>	91%	91%	95%
<b>Upland Qvidian</b>	90%	81%	83%
<b>QorusDocs</b>	90%	82%	87%
<b>Zip</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Precoro</b>	94%	92%	95%
<b>Ombud</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>RocketDocs</b>			
<b>Olive</b>	79%	83%	82%
<b>Average</b>	89%	85%	88%

(Feature Comparison for RFP continues on next page)

\*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question.

\*\*A blank box indicates that a seller has selected that they do not offer that feature.

# Feature Comparison for RFP (continued)

G2 users have evaluated the following products by feature. Feature ratings are representative of reviewers overall satisfaction with each feature and do not necessarily take into account the breadth of individual product features. The results are shown below.

## Submissions

	Collaboration	Knowledge Base	Review	Reporting
<b>Responsive, formerly RFPIO</b>	91%	90%	89%	81%
<b>Loopio</b>	95%	94%	93%	85%
<b>1up</b>	87%	97%	94%	73%
<b>Tribble</b>	91%	92%	91%	81%
<b>Upland Qvidian</b>	91%	87%	82%	86%
<b>QorusDocs</b>	92%	92%	89%	84%
<b>Zip</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Pecoro</b>	89%	89%	89%	91%
<b>Ombud</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>RocketDocs</b>	81%	85%	79%	64%
<b>Olive</b>	82%	77%	78%	78%
<b>Average</b>	89%	89%	87%	80%

(Feature Comparison for RFP continues on next page)

\*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question.

\*\*A blank box indicates that a seller has selected that they do not offer that feature.



# Feature Comparison for RFP (continued)

G2 users have evaluated the following products by feature. Feature ratings are representative of reviewers overall satisfaction with each feature and do not necessarily take into account the breadth of individual product features. The results are shown below.

## RFP Response

	Project Management	Content Library	Access	Automation	Export	Import
<b>Responsive, formerly RFPIO</b>	89%	90%	90%	78%	83%	83%
<b>Loopio</b>	93%	95%	94%	87%	86%	86%
<b>1up</b>	82%	91%	91%	94%	89%	92%
<b>Tribble</b>	89%	95%	90%	96%	90%	95%
<b>Upland Qvidian</b>	80%	87%	89%	83%	83%	87%
<b>QorusDocs</b>	87%	90%	89%	86%	86%	84%
<b>Zip</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Pecoro</b>	91%	93%	95%	86%	89%	89%
<b>Ombud</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>RocketDocs</b>	81%	89%	83%	63%	78%	69%
<b>Olive</b>	76%	77%	82%	79%	77%	80%
<b>Average</b>	85%	90%	89%	83%	85%	85%

\*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question.

\*\*A blank box indicates that a seller has selected that they do not offer that feature.

# Additional Data for RFP

The table below highlights implementation and deployment data as indicated in real user reviews on G2.

## Implementation

	Deployment		Implementation Time	Implementation Method				Number of Users Purchased	Contract Term
	Cloud	On-Premises	Avg. Months to Go Live	In-House Team	Seller Services Team	Third-Party Consultant	Don't know	Median Number of Users Bought	Avg. Contract Term (Months)
<b>Responsive, formerly RFPIO</b>	86%	14%	1.5	71%	14%	0%	15%	17	17
<b>Loopio</b>	74%	26%	1.3	69%	15%	0%	16%	17	16
<b>1up</b>	100%	0%	0.3	86%	14%	0%	0%	37	11
<b>Tribble</b>	80%	20%	1.3	40%	60%	0%	0%	N/A	N/A
<b>Upland Qvidian</b>	100%	0%	2.1	70%	20%	0%	10%	27	20
<b>QorusDocs</b>	68%	32%	5.3	61%	17%	0%	22%	17	19
<b>Zip</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Pecoro</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	86%	14%	0%	0%	N/A	N/A
<b>Ombud</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>RocketDocs</b>	42%	58%	3.6	54%	15%	8%	23%	7	14
<b>Olive</b>	88%	13%	2.8	83%	17%	0%	0%	3	N/A

(Additional Data for RFP continues on next page)

\*N/A is displayed when data is not publicly available.

# Additional Data for RFP (continued)

The table below highlights the average user adoption of each product as indicated in real user reviews on G2.

## User Adoption and Return on Investment (ROI)

	User Adoption	Payback Period
	Average User Adoption	Estimated ROI (payback period in months)
Responsive, formerly RFPIO	57%	12
Loopio	66%	8
1up	50%	4
Tribble	63%	6
Upland Qvidian	60%	N/A
QorusDocs	42%	17
Zip	N/A	N/A
Pecoro	N/A	N/A
Ombud	N/A	N/A
RocketDocs	64%	12
Olive	35%	N/A
<b>Average</b>	55%	10

(Additional Data for RFP continues on next page)

\*N/A is displayed when data is not publicly available.



# Additional Data for RFP (continued)

The table below highlights third-party market presence data used to inform the G2's Market Presence Score that highlights each products impact and influence in the category.

## Market Presence

	Seller Name	Year Founded	Employees on LinkedIn (Seller)	LinkedIn Followers
<b>Responsive, formerly RFPIO</b>	Responsive	2016	610	62,810
<b>Loopio</b>	Loopio Inc.	2014	274	28,371
<b>1up</b>	1up	2021	23	7,031
<b>Tribble</b>	Tribble	2023	11	18,564
<b>Upland Qvidian</b>	Upland Software	2010	1,030	21,887
<b>QorusDocs</b>	QorusDocs	2012	60	5,214
<b>Zip</b>	Zip	2020	603	20,342
<b>Precoro</b>	Precoro	2014	103	4,300
<b>Ombud</b>	Ombud	2011	43	2,712
<b>RocketDocs</b>	RocketDocs	1994	24	2,063
<b>Olive</b>	Olive Technologies	2018	23	3,614

\*N/A is displayed when data is not publicly available.