

VOLUME IV – EMPLOYER’S EVALUATION CRITERIA

^{A15}PREAMBLE

This volume of the RFP addresses how the Tender submitted by the respective Tenderers will be evaluated. ^{A17}Volume V cites the requirements of the various Parts to the Tender while this volume addresses the criteria that will be used to evaluate Tenders. All aspects of the criteria will be considered; however, those items addressed in Section 01 10 00 (*General Project Requirements*), paragraph 1.02 – Top Project Requirements, must be regarded as critical to the Tender. ^{A17} Failure to comply with these requirements will result in the Tender being regarded as non-responsive, and will therefore cause the Tender to be rejected in total.

Within this Volume, as well as Volume V, the phrases “develop and submit” or “prepare and submit” shall be understood to mean that the Tenderer is to develop or prepare the requisite document(s), drawing(s), programme(s), schedule(s), chart(s), calculation(s), plan(s), proposal(s), or said item(s), for submission with the complete Tender at the time of Tender submission. ^{A23} Submissions made after the deadline for submission of Tenders will not be accepted unless the submission is specifically in response to a request for clarification made by the Contracting Officer. ^{A23}

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

^{A17} Certain elements defined within the RFP require the Tenderers to submit concepts and work approaches that may be different relative to each other but are proposed by the respective Tenderer to meet the performance specifications or requirements of the Contract. These elements have a maximum point determination to which an Evaluation Grade will be assigned where stated. The Evaluation Grades and how they are determined are as follows, and are further summarized in Table A:

- **Excellent (E):** ^{A23} The proposal exceeds in a **significant** manner the Employer’s Requirements and provides exceptional added value to the Employer. There is little or no risk for the Tenderer to fail to satisfy the requirements of the Contract. ^{A23}
- **Very Good (VG):** ^{A23} The proposal exceeds the Employer’s Requirements and provides added value to the Employer. There is little or no risk for the Tenderer to fail to satisfy the requirements of the Contract. ^{A23}
- **Good (G):** ^{A23} The Tenderer demonstrates good approaches that comply with the Employer’s Requirements. There is a slight potential risk for the Tenderer to fail to satisfy some of the requirements of the Contract. ^{A23}
- **Marginal (M):** ^{A23} The approaches offered by the Tenderer have deviations from the Employer’s Requirements. There is doubt that the Tenderer may succeed to satisfy the requirements of the Contract. ^{A23}
- **Deficient (D):** The ^{A23} Tenderer demonstrates approaches that contain major weaknesses. The Tenderer’s proposal failed to comply with the Employer’s Requirements, or lacked clear, relevant, and critical information. There is a high risk that the Tenderer may fail to satisfy requirements of the Contract. ^{A23}

Table A: Adjective descriptions for qualitative technical criteria	
Evaluation Levels	Percentage
Excellent (E)	100%
Very good (VG)	90%
Good (G)	70%
Marginal (M)	60%
Deficient (D)	20%

Where stated in this Volume IV the score for an evaluation element will be the result of the consensus of all members within each evaluation team of the Technical Evaluation Board. That is, each evaluation team will decide consensually the score for each evaluation element.

GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE

This section of the Employer's Evaluation Criteria sets out how the Tenderer's understanding of the general and administrative elements of the Works and the requirements of the Contract will be evaluated.^{A17} Evaluation scores for these criteria are explained in Parts 1 through 2, with a total of 650 points assigned among them.

PART 1 – Overall Execution Plan (400 Points)

The Tenderer's overall execution plan shall present the Tenderer's overall plan and philosophy for execution of the Works. The format and content is prescribed in Volume V, Part 1. ^{A19}Evaluation of Part 1 will be both rigorous and adjectival, whereby the evaluation committee will review each Tenderer's submission in response to the Volume V, Part 1 requirements, scoring responses to each requirement (a) through (o) based on the Tenderer's demonstrated understanding of the objectives and constraints of the Works and the provision of a clear and cohesive strategy. Addressing each requirement (a) through (o) in a complete (all aspects of the requirement are addressed), clear, and concise manner will result in the Tenderer receiving 200 points (Table 1, first element). Failing to address a requirement will result in an automatic reduction of 13 points for each omitted requirement.^{A19}

The second scoring element of the plan will be on an adjectival basis considering the Tenderer's demonstrated understanding and approaches. ^{A17}200 points are available for this element, with each Tenderer awarded points determined by reference to the Evaluation Grade (applied to the available points as explained in the Evaluation Methodology set out above).^{A17}

The overall score for this part will be the sum of the scores for each element, which is a maximum of 400 points.

The evaluation criteria and corresponding points are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1							
Refer to Volume V, Part 1 Overall Execution Plan	Element	Points Available	Element	Points Available	Element	Points Available	Total Score
Overall Execution Plan	Plan addresses all requirements	200	Plan demonstrates an understanding of the objectives and constraints of the Works, and provides a clear and cohesive execution strategy.	200			400
TOTAL - Overall Execution Plan^{A15}							400

END OF DOCUMENT