



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



PROPOSALS EVALUATION RFP-DATA CENTER EQUIPMENT

Commercial Registry

July 27, 2008

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Pedro Valdes.

PROPOSALS EVALUATION

RFP-DATA CENTER EQUIPMENT

Commercial Registry

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR POLICY REFORM II

CONTRACT NUMBER: 263-C-00-05-00063-00

BEARINGPOINT, INC.

USAID/EGYPT POLICY AND PRIVATE SECTOR OFFICE

JULY 27, 2008

AUTHOR:

PEDRO VALDES

DISCLAIMER:

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

- 1.0 INTRODUCTION 2**
 - 1.1 Purpose 2
 - 1.2 Assumptions 2
- 2.0 EVALUATION TEAMS..... 2**
- 3.0 EVALUATION SCHEDULE 3**
- 4.0 EVALUATION PROCESS..... 3**
 - 4.1 Preliminary Evaluation 3
 - 4.2 Technical Evaluation 5
 - 4.2.1 Evaluation Criteria 5
 - 4.2.2 Ratings 6
 - 4.2.3 Weights 6
 - 4.2.4 Evaluation Instructions..... 7
 - 4.2.5 Additional/Special Evaluation 8
 - 4.3 Final Compiled Technical Evaluation Scores 8
 - 4.4 Cost/Price Evaluation 8
 - 4.5 Final Ranking..... 9

1.0 INTRODUCTION

As part of the Component E: “Facilitating Services for the Private Sector” of the Egypt TAPR-II engagement, the modernization of the Commercial Registry is an essential part of the efforts to help Egypt’s enterprises increase their competitive position.

A well designed and implemented commercial registry will assist the Government of Egypt in providing services to businesses and transparency and operational efficiencies to the entire registration process.

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this document is to describe the processes and procedures for the Evaluation of Proposals submitted under the RFP for the procurement of IT Equipment and Software for the establishment of the Commercial Registry Data Center.

1.2 Assumptions

The following assumptions have been taking into account while developing the Proposals Evaluation document:

- The Technical Evaluation will be performed in parallel by TAPR II and the CRA.
- The Cost/Price Evaluation will be performed only by TAPR II.

2.0 EVALUATION TEAMS

The evaluation teams will comprise of the IT Evaluation Team and the Cost/Price Evaluation Team. Their roles and timeframe are presented in the table below:

Team	Role Title	Role Definition	Timeframe
A	IT Evaluation Team	Experience in [process] management, strong subject matter knowledge and system design and implementation.	2 weeks
B	Cost/Price Evaluation Team	Accountant, procurement management and financial analysis experience.	2 days

The total number of evaluators for the IT Evaluation Team will be fourteen (4) distributed among TAPR II and CRA/MOTI according to the following table:

Entity	Evaluators
Commercial Registry Authority/Ministry of Trade and Industry (CRA-MOTI)	1
Technical Assistance for Policy Reform (TAPR II)	2

3.0 EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Team	Activity	Dates
All	Coordination and Training Meeting for Evaluation Teams	Day 1
A	Opening of Technical Proposals	Day 1
A	Distribution of Proposals to Evaluators (on-going on a daily basis)	Day 1
A	Preliminary Evaluation	Day 1
A	Assessment Meeting: Evaluate Vendors Eligibility	Day 1
A	Proposals Evaluation (Technical Specifications, References, Delivery, etc.)	Day 2-7
A	Evaluation Reports due (scores)	Day 8
B	Cost/Price Evaluation	Day 9
A-B	Compiled Evaluation Review Meeting and Final Report	Day 10

4.0 EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation process will follow a three step approach: Preliminary Evaluation, Technical Evaluation and Cost/Price Evaluation.

Technical Evaluators will compile their results in the Proposal Score Sheet (excel file) attached to this document. Evaluators should rename the Excel file by appending their initials to the file name:

Example: Pedro Valdes initials will be PV and the proposal score sheet should be renamed to: **CR-Proposals Evaluation RFP Data Center Equipment – PV.xls**

All evaluations should be done in English and the left-to-right orientation in the excel sheet should not be changed. No change in the formats of the fields/cell is allowed.

4.1 Preliminary Evaluation

The Preliminary Evaluation will address general mandatory requirements contained in the Instructions to Offerors section of the RFP. The mandatory requirements are as follows:

1. Proposal Identification
 - On time submission
 - (Electronic Copy/Original and one copy)
 - Check if Technical and Cost/Price are kept separated
 - If Offeror is a joint venture, check joint venture agreement
2. Content of Proposals

A proposal will be considered complete if it contains all elements listed below:

- a. Offer Schedule (to be checked during price evaluation)
- b. Installation, Warranty and Service Information
- c. Compatibility Certification
- d. Descriptive Literature

- e. Manufacturers Part Numbers
 - f. Schedule and Delivery (Work Plan)
 - g. Offer Acceptance Period 120 days
 - h. Offer Signature
3. Provisions
- a. Most favored customer representation and warranty
 - b. Conflicts of Interest Representation and Warranty
 - c. Representations, Certifications, and Other Statements of Offeror
4. Source/Origin and Nationality Statement

For the purpose of evaluating the Source/Origin and Nationality Statements, goods or services originating from non-eligible source countries under Geographic Code 935 must be rejected. The list of **non-eligible** countries is as follows: IRAN, SYRIA, CUBA, AND NORTH KOREA.

- Check that Offeror is a national or legal entity from an eligible source country
 - If the Offeror is a joint venture. Check that all partners are from an eligible source countries and that the joint venture is registered in an eligible source country.
 - Check that all goods and services originate from eligible source countries.
 - Check if Offeror (including all members of a joint venture and subcontractors) are affiliated with a firm that has provided related consulting services on the project.
5. Other Certifications and Provisions
- Most Favored Customer Representation and Warranty
 - Conflicts of Interest Representation and Warranty
 - Representations, Certifications, and Other Statements of Offerors

In addition the evaluators should:

- Check erasures, interlineations, additions and other changes. They must be initialed by the Offeror and that they are only corrective, editorial, or explanatory.
- Check all pages in the original copy (missing pages may be cause for rejection)

A proposal that does not comply with the mandatory requirements will be classified as non-responsive, and will result in rejection of the proposals.

4.2 Technical Evaluation

The Technical Evaluation will follow the Technical Evaluation Criteria as described in paragraph 1.14 of the RFP.

4.2.1 Evaluation Criteria

The Technical Evaluation criteria comprises of:

A. Product Specifications 25%

Factors affecting the Product Specifications will be evaluated with respect to the following requirements:

- All equipment in conformance to the technical specifications and configurations (Compatibility Certification)
- Manufacturer part numbers for all items included.
- Detailed product specifications provided

B. Installation, Warranty, Maintenance, and Service 25%

Factors that will be given preference under these criteria are as follows:

- Information on Manufacturer's Standard Warranty and availability of Extended Warranty periods for Hardware and Software provided
- Statement that warranty will be honored in Egypt
- Availability of Local Service Provider with all relevant information
- Maintenance Procedures
- Delivery, Installation and Testing Plan upon

C. Responsibility and References. 15%

The overall responsibility of the Offeror will be evaluated according to the following factors:

- Has a technical representative in Egypt to carry on all the required activities related to installation and the after implementation maintenance and support.
- Has provided at least three (3) references of similar implementations.

D. Schedule and Delivery. 15%

Preference will be given to vendors that will deliver install and fully test the Data Center equipment in the required timeframe (see sections 1.14 D and 2.4 Scope of Work in the RFP)

4.2.2 Ratings

The rating to be applied for the **Responsibility and References** criteria will consist of two different rating tables and a separate evaluation sheet for the references.

Offeror's Corporate Experience

Rating	Points
Significant	10
Very Good	8
Good	6
Limited	2

Offeror's Financial Position

Rating	Points
Low Risk/Very Good	10
Minimum Risk/Good	8
Moderate Risk/Limited	6
High Risk/None	2

For all the remaining evaluation criteria the following general rating will apply:

Rating	Points
Excellent, Has Fully Exceeded All Requirements	10
Has Met All Requirements And Surpassed Some	8
Acceptable	6
Has Met Some Minimum Requirements	4
Unacceptable, Has Not Met Criteria	0

4.2.3 Weights

The weight assigned to each evaluation criteria is equivalent to the percentages as described in Paragraph 4.2.1.

Evaluation Criteria	Weight
Product Specifications	25
Installation, Warranty, Maintenance, and Service	25
Responsibility and References	15
Schedule and Delivery	15

4.2.4 Evaluation Instructions

Evaluators will use the “Proposals Evaluation Table” (see Score Sheet) to record their evaluations.

The first step in the evaluation process is to replace “Offeror 1” with the name of the first company to be evaluated and then “Offeror 2” with the name of the second company, etc.

The evaluator will rate each proposal using the rating tables described above. Once the rating for a category has been entered, the weighted rating for that category will be automatically calculated: **as rating multiplied by the weight.**

Evaluators will review the references provided by the Offeror; and if necessary, they will schedule a conference call to perform an interview for the reference in question. These interviews will be conducted with the presence of all evaluators via conference call. The evaluators will record their own rating in the “Proposals Evaluation Table”

Since the Responsibilities and References evaluation criteria is subdivided in three sub criteria, the rating for that major criteria will be automatically calculated as the average value of the three sub-criteria.

The total weighted scores are calculated as the sum of all major criteria (exclusive sub criteria)

Example: Only shaded fields/cells are input fields. All others automatic calculated fields or line text and headings can not be changed.

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Offeror 1		Offeror 2		Offeror 3	
		Rating	WTxRT	Rating	WTxRT	Rating	WTxRT
Product Descriptions	25%	8	200	10	250	6	150
Installation, Warranty, Maintenance, and Service	25%	6	150	8	200	8	200
Responsibility and References	15%		100.00		90.00		70.00
Offeror's Corporate Experience		10	150	8	120	4	60
Offeror's Financial Position		6	90	10	150	6	90
References		4	60	0	0	4	60
Schedule and Delivery	15%	4	40	8	80	6	60
TOTAL WIGHTED SCORES	80%		490.00		620.00		480.00

4.2.5 Additional/Special Evaluation

In case of a tiebreak the evaluation results of the Minority/Disadvantaged Enterprises will be taken into account (See RFP paragraph 1.13)

Minority/Disadvantage Enterprises

Rating	Points
Proposal submitted by minorities	10
Proposal submitted as joint venture or subcontracting with minorities:	
> 50% of total amount	8
>10% - <50% of total amount	6
<10% of total amount	4
No participation by minorities	0

4.3 Final Compiled Technical Evaluation Scores

Once the technical evaluator has finalized his/her evaluation, the Proposals Evaluation Table will be used to compile the Final Compiled Technical Evaluation Scores which are calculated as the average score among all evaluators:

Example:

Offeror	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Average Score
Offeror 1	550.00	650.00	760.00	653.33
Offeror 2	670.00	750.00	700.00	706.67
Offeror 3	420.00	800.00	660.00	626.67

Anybody receiving an average score below 450 points will not be included in the Cost/Price Evaluation.

4.4 Cost/Price Evaluation

The Cost/Price Evaluation Score will be calculated by dividing lowest price among all proposals with the proposed price and then multiplied by 10 and multiplied by the weight (20). So the lowest will get always a score of 200 points.

Example: (This table will be available only for the Cost/Price Evaluation Team)

Cost Evaluation	Weight	Lowest Price	Offeror 1		Offeror 2		Offeror 3	
			Price	Score	Price	Score	Price	Score
Price	20	220,000	220,000	200.00	360,000	122.22	260,000	169.23

4.5 Final Ranking

The “Final Compiled Evaluation Scores” are then provided to the Cost/Price Evaluation Team as an input for the preparation of the “Final Ranking”. The Average Scores will be reflected automatically in the Final Ranking table as shown below.

KEY CATEGORIES				
Weighted Values as a Percentage of Total Score				
Offeror	20%	80%	Total Score	Ranking
	Price Scores	Technical Score		
Offeror 1	200.00	653.33	853.33	1
Offeror 2	122.22	706.67	828.89	2
Offeror 3	169.23	626.67	795.90	3

Technical Assistance for Policy Reform II
BearingPoint, Inc,
18 El Sad El Aali Street, 18th Floor,
Dokki, Giza
Egypt
Country Code: 12311
Phone: +2 02 335 5507
Fax: +2 02 337 7684
Web address: www.usaideconomic.org.eg